

A VINDICATION OF AURANGZEB

(in two parts)

BY

SADIQ ALI,

of Kapurthala,
The Funjab.

PREFACE.

My object in writing this essay is to caution students of the history of the Indian Mughals against credulity in regard to European historians, who have certainly made gross and unpardonable mistakes when describing events and making comments in their histories of India, particularly those portions treating of Aurangzeb's reign.

The essay was submitted to a very talented and kind friend and patron of mine for his opinion. He criticised the work in a very indulgent and polite manner, and sent it back to me with his criticism.

As my brevity seemed the cause of many objections, I thought it necessary to explain my views in greater detail, which would serve as replies to the criticism. Thus the second portion of the book came into existence.

I have appended an abstract of the criticism to the second portion of the book to enable readers to understand the *raison d'être* of the addition.

It is not perhaps out of place to tell my readers that I was as much prejudiced against Aurangzeb as any Indian schoolboy could be, until a few years back. I had in fact imbibed all my notions on this subject from the current Indian histories written by foreign authors.

Then came a special opportunity and inclination to

study Indian history from the original Persian works, and from as many works of foreign authors on the subject as I could procure. As my natural turn of mind is what is termed free-thinking—for which people often blame me—I am averse to unquestioned obedience to ‘authorities’ on matters in which I have an opportunity of making independent inquiries. I always take facts, evidence, and intuition for my guide in forming opinions and passing judgments. On studying the above-mentioned books, and patiently reflecting on what they taught, I was surprised to find them running counter to all my preconceived ideas of Aurangzeb’s life and character. This was to me a revelation, so I wished to communicate it to others; but having no pretensions to scholarship in any department of letters I felt diffident of publishing my ideas and opinions. At all events I put the wish aside for a long time considering it impracticable and of doubtful utility. Now, however, I feel impelled to bring out this essay, but cannot say whether it is the knowledge of the truth of my facts, or the conviction that it may prove of service in attaining my object, which inclines me to publish it.

I know there are some people who never try to shake off the grip of ‘authorities.’ There are others who never lay aside their prejudices when examining a subject; while others, fearing the censure of public opinion, never like to deviate from the beaten path. I have, of course, no right to ask such to forego their long cherished casts of thought or inclinations, but I

earnestly appeal to them (if there be any such among my readers), and to those of my kind readers, who relish a change when it is in the public interest or reasons call for it or it is based upon broad foundations of fact, to give an impartial consideration to this humble essay.

In publishing this treatise I have a double object in view. First, to clear up the truth about, and expel the errors from, a great historical event, which has been clouded over by dark aspersions. Secondly, to help in promoting brotherly love among the Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims of this my country.

I have always perceived that the misrepresentations and distorted facts in the history of Aurangzeb's life and character tend to fan the smouldering fire of ill-blood and discord in the hearts of the fellow-citizens of this country,—to me a deplorable result.

What is required is good fellow-feeling, brotherly love and concord, without which there can be no unity; and unity just now is of paramount importance for assuring a successful political and industrial future.

I have taken up this work in the spirit of love and with the view of promoting truth. I know I am not infallible and so I am as liable to err as anyone else. Like the eye, which sees other things but not itself, we see the faults of others but not our own. This is a common failing of poor, human nature, to which therefore I may likewise be subject. I may make mistakes which can be easily detected by others though not by me. For this reason I deem it unjust to be partial to

one's own views if their baselessness is clearly proved.

If any reader feels disposed to criticise the views put forth in this essay I shall welcome his criticism ; and if by any means I am in error and proved to be so by undeniable facts and irrefutable proofs, I will bow to my critic, own my faults, change my opinion upon the points elucidated, and acknowledge the service done me with a deep sense of gratitude.

Kapurthala,
September, 1916.

}

SADIQ ALI.

CONTENTS OF PART I.

CHAPTER I. Page 3.

Classes of historians,—their opinions of Aurangzeb and reasons for same.

Quotations showing the characters and capacities of Manucci and Bernier.

The value of the writings of Manucci and Bernier with a brief summary of Manucci's life, and comments thereon.

Facts concerning the "Storia de Mogor."

Bernier and the "Battle of Samugarh" together with his subsequent history.

Mansabs and the grading of mansabdars.

Tavernier.

The value of the accounts of Muhammadan and European historians contrasted.

The influence of the writings of European travellers upon the history of India.

CHAPTER II. Page 21.

A sketch of the Mughal Empire to Aurangzeb's time, (Zahir-uddin Babar,—Humayun,—Sher Shah,—Akbar with his policy of intermarriages and its questionable utility,—Jahangir,—Shahjahan,—Shahjahan's four sons).

Aurangzeb—His unwillingness to cause civil war. Why he was forced to take up arms.

His signal success.

His treatment of Dara, Murad and Shuja.

Treatment of his father, its cause, and justification.

The treachery of Raja Jaswant Singh

Jaswant Singh's pardon and its result.

The execution of Dara and Murad.

Aurangzeb vindicated as not responsible for their deaths.

CHAPTER III. Page 52

Quotations from the English historians, S. Lane Poole, Alexander Dow, and Pringle Kennedy, showing how they agree with Indian historians regarding the good qualities of Aurangzeb
 Extracts from Aurangzeb's letters to his father.

Aurangzeb compared with Louis XIV, to whom he bore resemblance.

Quotations from Hassall's "History of Louis XIV" for the above comparison

The use of force by governments generally, and in controlling foreign conquests

Why Europeans succeed in maintaining their foreign conquests while Asiatics do not

CHAPTER IV. Page 89

Duties of biographers and historians, and how they are guided in forming estimates of character.

Aurangzeb's reputed avariciousness disputed and his generosity vindicated.

Two ways of judging Aurangzeb's character, which if followed show him to have been of exemplary character.

Another revelation to the author, and how it could be advantageously utilised

The effect, on Indian history of the writings of Manucci, Bernier and Tavernier.

These, though admittedly unreliable, European historians quote as authorities

The drink and drug question

The reported death, by drug poisoning of the sons of Dara and Murad Bakhsh, proved untrue,—with authors experience

Waging the Deccan wars for religion's sake, and comments thereon.

A quotation touching the Deccan wars with author's remarks.

Dara and Shuja as infidels (a quotation), with notes.

Bernier and the horrors of the fratricidal war.

Quotation condemning Aurangzeb's method of securing the throne shown to be contradictory of facts.

A dark picture of Aurangzeb's character by Alexander Dow, proved to be a false representation.

Comments on Tavernier's assertion that no animal food passed the lips of Aurangzeb.

Weakness of the quoted criticisms further exposed.

CHAPTER V. Page 120.

Aurangzeb's actions looked at from another point of view.

Events of past ages ought not to be judged by the standard of modern politics.

Things allowed in the past as worthy, considered unworthy now.

Ancient institutions held right and justifiable not considered so now, (slavery, polygamy, religious persecution).

How the latter arose.

Religious intolerance.

The injustice and unreasonableness of some present institutions.

Aurangzeb's mild and wise methods of conversion explained.

His treatment of the Hindus, with reasons.

The "jazia" tax,—its fairness and moderation.

Why Mohamedans were allowed a few inconsiderable privileges.

CHAPTER VI. Page 131.

Aurangzeb's character full of flaws when viewed rationalistically.

Comments on Khafi Khan's statement, "Aurangzeb did not make use of punishment, and without punishment the ad-

ministration of a country cannot be maintained."

An interesting description of Aurangzeb's conduct in his old age during the Deccan wars.

His almost total disregard of worldly means for securing his objects.

Acting under impulses produced by present circumstances.

His treatment of Sivaji.

The sensitiveness of his religious frame of mind.

The Rajput chiefs and Jaswant Singh's infant sons.

CHAPTER VII. Page 142.

Aurangzeb's character and conduct in advance of his age.

His lenient treatment of enemies, rebels, traitors and prisoners of war who fell into his hands.

Permitting subjects to sue the government.

Idle stories.

Writing fictitious letters.

Aurangzeb the greatest and best eastern monarch that ever governed India,—with reasons, and a quotation to that effect from Lane-Poole's "Medieval India."

Tabular statement showing revenue in Aurangzeb's reign over that of preceding reigns.

Khafi Khan's remark, "Every plan he made came to naught, and every enterprise failed."—Its interpretation.

Aurangzeb's useful public works during times of peace.

Aurangzeb's triumph over the Deccan where so many others had failed.

Mir Jumla's death, and Aurangzeb's remark concerning it.

Public institutions and social morals change with the change of circumstances and individual and social conditions.

CONTENTS OF PART II.

CRITICISMS. Page 155.

CHAPTER I. ... 158.

Manucci's medical knowledge and practice, and the consequence to him of the latter.

The status of barber-surgeons in Europe and India.

Manucci's status in the Indian medical profession.

Contradictory statements by Manucci and Legrenzi.

The reliability of these two writers.

Manucci's pay.

Quotations relating to the "Storia de Mogor" and its polyglot character.

An epitome of Manucci's career in India, showing that he did live at Aurangzeb's court.

Manucci's sources of information.

A miniature image of "Storia" that European readers may be able to judge from its effect on their own minds, something of the impression made on the minds of Indians by the "Storia de Mogor."

CHAPTER II. Page 177.

A miniature image of "Storia" that European readers may be able to judge from its effect on their own minds, something of the impression made on the minds of Indians by the "Storia de Mogor".

CHAPTER III. Page 195.

The statement of some historians that Dr. Bernier was in Aurangzeb's retinue at the Battle of Samugarh confuted.

Certain errors of historians which can and should be avoided.

Other mistakes or differences of opinion which are less avoidable,—religious, racial, educational, sentimental.

Comment on "Aurangzeb was a compound of good and evil."

The letters, which appeared in "Modern Review," between Aurangzeb and Prince Akbar, given in an article by Prof. J. N. Sarkar, criticised.

How spurious letters purporting to be Aurangzeb's came into existence.

"Might constitutes right."

The strain upon the Mughal system of government.

Views about regicides and fratricides.

Manucci's disguise and its needlessness.

Manucci's insignificance in India.

The modern tendency of "Whitewashing every one in the past."

Different nations cannot be brought to the same level of civilisation, nor to obey similar laws, therefore should not be judged by the same standard of right and wrong.

The polyglot character of "Storia,"—my theory about it, and a confirmation of my theory.

CHAPTER IV. Page 220.

The author's indebtedness to other writers.

Information to be gained by the study of reliable historians.

The discovery of two other sources of information,—Aurangzeb's letters and firmans of land-grants.

Comment on letters and firmans, which show Aurangzeb to have been a most generous and impartial benefactor.

Only three of the charges brought against Aurangzeb, have any apparent foundation in fact.

Aurangzeb's methods of government compared with those of contemporary sovereigns.

APPENDIX, Page 227.

(a) Letters between Aurangzeb and his son, Akbar.

(b) Concerning dubious and fictitious letters.

Professor Sarkar's attitude towards Aurangzeb.

The use of "posta" for poisoning the princes in Gwalior Fort.

PART I.

perfect, inaccurate and misleading as modern English writers admit without reserve. But most European historians consider those books good authorities and sympathise with them. Secondly, the difference of tradition, sentiment and culture of Europeans and Asiatics leads them to an improper understanding of, and lack of sympathy with, each other. Thirdly, racial and religious conceit prevents people making a just estimate of one another's character and good qualities.

Manucci's *Storia de Mogor* and 'Bernier's Travels' are considered authorities on the history of the Mughal Empire, and therefore are most generally drawn upon by European historians.

To show the value of these books and the character and capacity of their authors, I cannot do better than quote here a few English authors.

"Niccolas Manucci was a native of Venice. In 1653, at the age of fourteen, he ran away from home, and having entered the service of a certain Viscount Bellemont, accompanied him via Smyrna and Isphahan to Gombron, whence the two sailed to Surat, reaching that port in February 1656. Not long after they left, by the usual route through Burhanpur and Gwalior, for Agra, which they reached safely; but in the course of their journey to Delhi, where the Mughal court has now taken up its residence, Bellemont died. Manucci, who was still little more than a boy, was now masterless. The struggle, however, between Dara on the one side, and Aurangzeb and Murad Bakhsh on the other, had

just begun, and Manucci had no difficulty in obtaining a position as artilleryman in Dara's army. As Bernier was at this time in the retinue of Aurangzeb, it happens that we are in possession of two independent European accounts of the battle of Samugarh, written from opposite points of view. The result of the engagement destroyed all Dara's hopes of a throne, and Manucci, who apparently cut no heroic figure in the conflict, fled to Agra and attached himself in disguise to the army of victorious Aurangzeb. After witnessing Aurangzeb's seizure of Murad Bakhsh, he reattached himself to Dara, who was now at Lahore, and accompanied him to Multan and Bhakhar. He was now appointed captain of Dara's artillery, but, upon the capture and execution of Dara, was again thrown out of employment, and, as his dislike of Aurangzeb prevented him joining that prince, he remained so for some short time. After again visiting Delhi and Agra, and travelling in Bengal, Manucci, in the true spirit of 'jack-of-all-trades,' which he was, blossomed forth into a quack doctor. Finding medicine distasteful or not sufficiently lucrative or exciting, he again took up the profession of arms,—this time in the service of Raja Jai Singh.....Manucci now spent six or seven years at Lahore, and gained a small portion from his fees for medical advice. He now determined to settle down and enjoy his competency, and selected Salsette Island as the place of his retreat. An unfortunate commercial speculation swallowing up all he possessed, Manucci, after a short period of quiescence, was

compelled to become a wanderer again. Returning to Delhi he was lucky enough to cure a wife of Shah Alam of an affliction of the ear, and was immediately appointed one of that official's physicians." (*Oaten's Travels in India*).

These passages clearly show that Manucci was not an educated man. His passing himself off for a doctor, taking advantage of the common peoples' ignorance, and making no scruple of deceiving the people and taking such grave responsibility upon himself when he knew he was not fit for it, show unquestionably that Manucci was not a trustworthy man. There is no proof of his own statement. He could easily impose upon the ignorant people in the bazars of Lahore and other towns but he could not deceive Shah Alam's Durbar. We know for certain that those people were extremely scrupulous about taking medicine from any one in whom they could not place absolute confidence. I also wonder why Mr. Keene calls him *Doctor* Manucci in his *History of India*.

In the above quotation it is stated that Manucci attached himself to Aurangzeb's army in disguise, after fleeing from Samugarh. This shows a total ignorance of Indian politics of Aurangzeb's age on the part of the writer of this incredible story. At that time all the princes of royal blood were by everyone admitted to have equal rights to ascend their father's throne. At the demise of the crown all the rivals entered the arena to try conclusions with one another, and thus the ordeal

of war awarded the contested prize to the victor who survived. The parties siding with these rivals did not fight for their liberty, religion or nation, but to remove the difficulty of rivalry which destroyed peace and order in the country, and thus to find out the fittest for the throne. The people, previously in the service, under the command, or in the pay of a claimant to the throne, or having some friendly relation or inclination towards him, or notions hostile to his rival, or the selfish motives of gaining wealth, power or other interest, gathered round his standard and thus his armament was completed. When the rival forces took the field they at first fought in the hope of gaining conquest and its fruits. But as soon as they discovered the party that would, in their estimation, certainly prevail, they deserted their master and went to hail the rising sun. Such an act was never thought treasonable or ignoble. The principal object of these wars used to be to find out, *by the ordeal of war, the fittest survivor to pay homage to.* These people were received with great favour and honour by those to whom they deserted. The other party tried, of course, to prevent their desertion but the losing side never succeeded in doing so. For instance, Maharaja Jai Singh, the great general of Dara Shukoh, and among the first nobles of the Emplre, was sent with Prince Sulaiman Shukoh to fight Shuja in Bengal. He fought and actually won the battle, and Shuja had to save his life by taking to flight. After this triumph he received news that Aurangzeb had defeated Dara

Shukoh at Samugarh. The Maharaja and many other Umara went to the prince and informed him that Aurangzeb had defeated his (the prince's) father and therefore they could stay no longer with him, and that they had resolved to go to the conqueror. They left the prince's camp, came to Aurangzeb, and swore fealty to him. Such conduct was considered reasonable and unblamable in those days. After the defeat of the rivals their nobles and officers went to the winning party and were received with open arms. Even on the prisoners of war Aurangzeb never inflicted the slightest punishment.

People who know the kind of politics of those days cannot understand why Manucci had to disguise himself after Dara's defeat in order to attach himself to Aurangzeb's army. If Aurangzeb had known that one of Dara's European gunners, after his defeat, had come to him asking for employment, he would certainly have taken him into his service and allowed him suitable pay. Besides this his foreign accent would have surely betrayed him very soon; he could not have remained long disguised.

The fabricator of this story was certainly ignorant of the most common Indian usages of that age.

Manucci's memoirs, *Storia de Mogor*, were published recently in English, in four volumes. Very strange circumstances have gathered round the discovery of this book. It was never published during Manucci's lifetime, nor till long after his death. Some people

know that he had written a book, and one or two writers referred to his memoirs in their writings. Towards the end of the last century the manuscript copy of the book was found in Berlin. It is alleged to have been written in three languages,—French, Portuguse and Italian.

Now Manucci was a boy when he left his home and came to India. He therefore passed nearly his whole life in India. There were no schools for teaching European languages in India in those days. He could not have learnt foreign languages in his mother-country nor in India. Some clever folk can, no doubt, learn different languages simply by living among different nations and hearing them talk. But their knowledge of those languages remains very limited; they cannot write books in languages so imperfectly learned. How, then, could Manucci have written his book in three languages? It is difficult to understand (unless the theory I advance on the last page of this work be accepted) even supposing Manucci to have been an extraordinary genius and learnt two foreign languages by simply hearing them spoken and having verbal practice with foreigners. Why he wrote his history in three portions, each portion in a separate language, is impossible to understand. The internal evidence of the book proves that it was not written by a man well acquainted with Indian usages. Manucci lived about seventy years in India, therefore he cannot be supposed to have been so ignorant of Indian customs. One instance of this kind has already been stated, viz. when Manucci disguised himself from

such pretensions some indulge in them.

There is another similar story mentioned in *Storia* viz. that Aurangzeb allowed one of his wives to drink wine in his presence. But those people who know Aurangzeb's character and religious fervour reject such statements as utterly false. Aurangzeb would rather have given up his kingdom than suffer any favourite to drink in his house.

Dr. Bernier was no doubt much superior in capacity and character to Manucci, but still his book has a romantic character and is full of errors. I do not know how gross errors slip into such sober writings as *Oaten's Travels in India* already quoted. He says: "As Bernier was at this time in the retinue of Aurangzeb, it happens that we are in possession of two independent European accounts of the Battle of Samugarh, written from opposite points of view." The Battle of Samugarh occurred between Aurangzeb and Dara Shukoh in the middle of 1658, when Dr. Bernier had not yet reached the shores of the Indian Peninsula. After this battle Dara fled to the Punjab and Aurangzeb pursued him to Multan, whence he hurried back to Bengal to suppress Shuja who was then advancing towards Agra with a strong force. He fought with Shuja at Khajwa, defeated him, and then returned to Agra. Dara, after wandering as a fugitive in Sindh, went to Gujrat where he was welcomed by the Subedar and other nobles, was able to raise an army to advance towards Agra and had to fight Aurangzeb a second time at Ajmer. Here his

The mansab was graded in proportion to the number of soldiers required of him to supply. But the mansab was granted in two forms, personal and sawars, which latter went up from five sawars (the lowest number) to 5,000 or more. This double system of mansabs requires some explanation. There were some Umara—pl. of Amir—for instance called 'One-thousand,—two-hundred sawars' ('1000,—200 sawars'). This means that the Amir was paid by the Government a thousand sawars' pay, at the rate of 20 rupees per sawar per month, making 20,000 rupees a month. This was his personal allowance. The two-hundred sawars, subjoined to the one-thousand, means that he had to entertain 200 sawars in his service and supply them to the government whenever required. For their upkeep he was paid 200 sawars' pay besides the personal allowance of 1000 sawars' pay. Thus a man among the lower mansabdars being '10-5 sawars' received 200 rupees a month as his personal allowance, and 100 rupees a month for maintaining 5 sawars in his service, the said sawars to be supplied to the government in time of need. The highest nobles of the State, like Raja Jai Singh and Mir Jumla, held the rank of '7000-7000 sawars.' This means the pay of 7000 sawars as personal allowance, and the pay of 7000 sawars in addition, for maintaining 7000 sawars whose services were at the disposal of government. The great nobles were generally granted 'jagirs' whose revenue supplied them with the personal and sawars' pay. There was another form

of promotion in rank. Sometimes the rank or 'zat' number (the first number, i.e. 1000, given in the combination '1000,—200 sawars') and the number of sawars to be maintained by the mansabdar were not augmented, but the allowance for the sawars was increased by making some or all of them 'double and triple horsed.' In this way the allowance was doubled. Take, for instance, 1000 sawars made 'double and triple horsed.' Then 300 of them received three times the ordinary pay equal to 900 men; 400 received double pay, equal to 800 men; while 300 retained the ordinary single pay. Thus $900 + 800 + 300 = 2000$ or double the original number for which allowance was granted.

When Dr. Bernier was granted a monthly allowance he was not granted any rank. This fact shows that he was not taken into State service, but, as an indigent and meritorious traveller, got some allowance from the Charity Fund,—a considerable sum set apart every year to help the necessitous, meritorious and wayfarers. Bernier called his *Agha*, Danishmand Khan, his master, either because he was his patron or for being taken into the Khan's service and paid by him. It is certain that Bernier had nothing to do with the Imperial Court or the harem, never attended the court and never had an opportunity of talking to Aurangzeb personally or hearing him talk to others. When Barnier was in Delhi, the emperor was taken seriously ill. Bernier was never consulted about his illness. Whatever he saw with his own eyes he may have recorded faithfully,

but I have read his book and found it full of errors and inaccuracies. It contains some things very interesting, particularly to European readers, e.g. his description of the city of Delhi, some Indian customs like 'suttee' and many other commonplace things; but as a book on Indian history it is of no value at all. Oaten says that Bernier was twelve years at Aurangzeb's Court. He himself asserts in his travels that he was eight years at the Mughal Court; in reality he was a little more than five years, or six at the longest, in Delhi and with the camp of Aurangzeb when that monarch was going to Kashmir,—but in the service of Danishmand Khan, not of Aurangzeb. He reached Delhi towards the end of 1659 and left it about the middle of 1665. All the events about the War of Succession and previous to it, narrated in his book, were taken from bazaar gossip. Oaten's statement that Bernier was then in Aurangzeb's retinue is false; he must have been at the time in Egypt or Persia.

Bernier, in his book, says that he heard of Shah-jahan's death when he was at Golkanda on his way back to France. The emperor's death occurred on the 22nd of January, 1666, but he records subsequent events as if he were an eye-witness of them.

Another French traveller, Tavernier the jeweller, visited India five times during Shahjahan and Aurangzeb's reigns. He also recorded his memoirs which were published in two volumes; but the greater part of that work is taken up by information concerning matters of

interest to his own calling. He throws some light on the government and customs of the Indian people at that period, but the bulk of this information is also based upon second-hand, untrustworthy sources.

I quote below the opinions of two English historians, who seem to have been good oriental scholars, on the comparative value and trustworthiness of Indian and European writers of Indian history. The untrustworthiness of *Storia* has already been proved by the unfavourable comments on it of Governor Pitt and Mr. S. L. Poole. Dr. Bernier has recorded in his book a pretty long speech that Aurangzeb addressed to one of his old teachers on the uselessness of the knowledge he had taught him, and telling him what kind of education was suitable for princes. Mr. Pringle Kennedy, the author of *The History of Great Mughals*, criticising Bernier on this discourse says :—

“The whole speech savours of a lively French invention ; it is what we might expect from a Frenchman living in the same half-century as Fenelon and other moral authors of Louis XIV’s court ; beyond the fact that the tutor did not get what he wanted and was sent away without having been shown any favour, it is not safe to accept any other part of the story. Bernier indeed only used the license which other ancient and mediæval writers have used, i.e. of putting into their heros’ mouths what they think they would have said, without knowing in the least what they actually did say”.....

"But all the same the kernel of veracity, the desire to tell what is true, and the trouble to find it out, are everywhere to be found in our Indian Muhammadan historians. They have [practical historical sense strongly developed, and their accounts are to be preferred to those of any European traveller when one wishes really to study the history of the time. European visitors to India may be taken to truly report what they themselves have seen; but a great part of their writings is taken up with what they heard, and much of this must have been from their own servants, the most unreliable of all the native sources."

Alexandar Dow, author of *The History of India*, says:—"Though the manner of eastern composition differs from the correct taste of Europe, there are many things in the writings of Asiatic authors worthy of the attention of literary men. Their poetry, it must be confessed, is too turgid and full of conceits to please, and the diction of their historians very diffuse and verbose: yet amidst the redundancy of the latter, we find that scrupulous attention to truth, and that manliness of sentiment, which constitute the very essence of good history."

I have seen Manucci and Bernier quoted, in several English histories of India, as their great authorities. This fact reminds me of a story I read very long ago in Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World*. I then thought it simply a fable only fit to entertain the imagination of its readers; but when I saw Aurangzeb's historians

basing their opinions on Manucci and other European travellers I learned that the *Chinaman's* opinion about the Englishman was not unfounded. The following is a short extract from the story to which I allude.

"This universal passion for politics is gratified by daily gazettes, as with us in China. But as in ours the emperor endeavours to instruct his people, in theirs the people endeavour to instruct the Administration. You must not, however, imagine that they who compile these papers have any actual knowledge of the politics or the Government of State; they only collect their materials from the oracle of some coffee-house, which oracle has himself gathered them the night before from a bean at a gaming-table, who has pillaged his knowledge from a great man's portfolio, who has had his information from a great man's gentleman, who has invented the whole story for his own amusement the night preceding."

I have dwelt upon the subject of European travellers at some length because they have played a greater part in misleading subsequent writers than other causes. The remaining two causes referred to at the outset require no comment as their influence in biassing the mind generally is unquestionable.

By what I have already advanced I do not mean to plead for Aurangzeb or vindicate him as one prepossessed in his favour. I do not consider him perfect nor can any man be perfect in this world. Everybody has his defects and Aurangzeb has his. When translating

Iqbalnama Alamgiri I had to read many works, both Persian and English, on that monarch's life and reign, and finding both classes entirely at variance with each other in making an estimate of Aurangzeb's character, I was astonished and at a loss to account for the difference. I deliberated on the question some time and have formulated my decision in this treatise. I have chosen for discussion only those points which the foreign historians of Aurangzeb have treated illogically and unhistorically. The opinions they have formed are generally based on uncertain data and therefore ought to be excluded from true history.



CHAPTER II.

I give here a short sketch of the Mughal Empire in India, mentioning only those events which have been generally admitted by historians, thus placing a true picture of that age before my readers to enable them to distinguish the facts from the fables dispersed indiscriminately throughout the works of foreign writers on the reign of Aurangzeb.

Zahiruddin Babar, a descendant of Timur, after a long career of varied fortunes in his mother-country and Afghanistan, invaded Hindustan in 1526, reigned about four years after his conquest, and at death left the throne to his eldest son Humayun. Humayun had three brothers—Kamran, Hindal and Mirza Askari. The first-named was Governor of Kabul and Kandahar. He attacked the Punjab and wrested this province from Humayun. The latter did not resent this encroachment of his brother but willingly left the province in his possession. Humayun also gave his other brothers appointments in the government of India. This unfortunate king had to encounter many rebellions and revolts, constantly fighting till 1540, when he was completely defeated by Sher Shah and took to flight. After wandering for two years in Sindh and other parts of India, in the vain hope of getting succour from some friendly chief and people, he turned to Kandahar and then to Isphahan as a refugee. In his absence

Sher Shah governed the country very ably for five years, and after his death his successors,—none of whom proved fit for princely duties—reigned some years. Humayun, with the help of the Persian King, conquered Kandahar and Kabul from his brothers, punished them severely, and then in 1555 invaded Hindustan, reconquered the greater part of his Kingdom, but reigned over it only six months, for meeting with an accident he died and left the kingdom to his son Akbar who was then only thirteen years of age. Bairam Khan, Humaynn's very able minister, became Akbar's regent, and the defeat of Sikandar Sur and Hemu confirmed him on the throne of Delhi. In 1560, when Akbar was eighteen years old, he took the reins of Government into his own hands. He continued extending the boundaries of his empire, organising and administering it as best as he could, till his death in 1605. Akbar was a free-thinker: he abolished the *jazia* tax on non-Muslims, which had been imposed by all his predecessors, but he imposed in various forms many other taxes on his subjects. He originated the custom of marrying the daughters of Hindu rajas. He was exceptionally fortunate in possessing excellent ministers and generals but he was never free from war for a single year of his long reign. Hindus never submit to the most humiliating custom of giving their daughters in marriage to non-Hindus, but Akbar's predecessors had for centuries so terrorised the country by their harsh and severe rule that Akbar's proposal of marrying the daughters of

rajas, as a means of securing their friendship, was accepted by some Rajput rajas with apparent willingness, though at bottom it was a kind of forced conversion. Akbar was a very wise statesman, very able administrator and a very great king. His physical strength, power of endurance, valour and strategy were all unsurpassed. He discouraged the custom of *suttee*, and insisted on the consent of the bride and bridegroom and the permission of the parents as absolutely necessary in marriage contracts. Though he was generally very just and kind he was not always indulgent in regard to his enemies or criminals. He sometimes had his enemies and prisoners of war crushed under the feet of elephants, or made pyramids of thousands of rebels' heads. According to Abul Fazal's report there were in the harem more than 5000 women in various capacities. He made war with the great rajas of Rajputana, defeated them, and forced them into submission. It was not his asking Rajputs to give him their daughters in marriage that won their friendship and alliance, but it was the crushing defeats he inflicted upon them that forced them to acquiesce in his exorbitant and humiliating demands and to submit to him unconditionally.

European historians extol Akbar's action of establishing matrimonial relations with Indian rajas as prudence, contending that it was to consolidate his power, as if the brave Rajputs, owing to this relation, would sympathise with the interests of the empire and continue to support it. No opinion can be more erro-

neous. ('Kingship knows no kinship') has been proved true by universal experience. If an ambitious person gets an opportunity, or thinks he has it, of gratifying his aspirations for power and self-aggrandisement, no blood relation or matrimonial alliance will ever succeed in checking the passion. The histories of ancient, medieval and modern times substantiate this statement. Even the present Great War, that has broken out among the most civilised nations, presents an unmistakable manifestation of the same principle. All wars of succession in any part of the world, but particularly in Europe, have been waged between related princes.

Difference of religion is a still stronger motive of rancour and animosity than ambition. No kind of connection counts for anything against it. "I came not to send peace but a sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother.....and a man's foes shall be they of his own household." This is the speech of a true 'Prince of Peace,' a warning to his people of the necessary result of his mission. It is absolutely absurd for two nations of different religions to try to sympathise with each other to the same extent as they do with their own co-religionists.

Akbar's method of getting Hindus reconciled to Muslim invaders by introducing inter-marriage between them was unreasonable. But for gaining the same object, Aurangzeb's method of encouraging Hindus to

become Muslims was perfectly reasonable. But Aurangzeb's sense of duty was much keener than that of anything else, so he could not apply himself directly to missionary work. Neither of the great emperors succeeded in his object, but the former acted in an entirely wrong way, and the latter chose the only means which was right and reasonable for obtaining the object in view.

Akbar's institution of intermarriage or marrying Rajput ladies really sapped the foundations of the lofty edifice of his empire. The Rajputs were the noblest race among Hindus. Their mental and moral qualities were much superior to those of any other people of India. The chiefs were hereditary rulers of their principalities, some of which were as big as the present lesser kingdoms of Europe. The mutual jealousy of their clans had long divided them so widely that they could not unite in a common cause. For this reason only were they often conquered by and subjugated to the foreign conquerors. They were faithful and true to their pledges. They naturally did not like to submit to any superior power, and much less to the power wielded by people of a very different race and religion. But when conquered and pressed by irresistible force they swore fealty to their conquerors and generally kept their engagements.

No religion had hold upon Akbar's mind. He considered the kingship the only aim and object of his existence. He tried to mitigate the religious rancour

of his Hindu subjects, especially of the chiefs and nobles, and to reconcile them with their foreign conquerors. He painted his forehead with sandal paste, saffron or turmeric, and adopted some other Hindu customs to obtain their friendship, but all his schemes failed. He could not remove their religious prejudices and superstitions. Their religious and social customs are very rigid; they can neither admit Muhammadans into their religious fraternity nor associate with them freely. He then started the custom of marrying Hindu ladies, vainly hoping perhaps, to reconcile the Hindus in that way. Though they dared not murmur against this—Akbar's unbearable tyranny—it struck a very heavy blow to their racial and religious pride, and it kept rankling in their minds and induced them to shake off the yoke at the first opportunity they got. Besides this, the admixture of Indian blood caused degeneration in the Mughal race. These two causes combining with other natural causes hastened the downfall of the Mughal Empire in India. It would certainly have fallen after Shajahan's death, or perhaps some years before it, when the four princes took up arms against one another, each determined to take sole possession of the whole empire, and to annihilate all other rival claimants. Every one of them had sufficient resources to carry on war indefinitely, and Indian chiefs and imperial nobles were found among the supporters of each. If Aurangzeb, with his extraordinary gifts of nature—mental, moral and physical—had not been able to stem the

tide wonderfully quickly, the civil wars would have certainly destroyed the empire, and India would have been in an anarchical and chaotic state.

Akbar's irreligious mind gave rein to his son's licentious propensities. They all took to drinking to excess, from which two of them died before their father. Only one, Prince Salim, survived him but he was also a sot, though otherwise an able administrator. As he had once rebelled against his father, and had his best and ablest counsellor and minister, Abul Fazal, killed, Akbar was very much against him and did not make him his heir-apparent. But at the time of his death, through force of circumstances, Akbar was reconciled with him and reluctantly bequeathed the throne to him. If there had been any rivals living at the demise of the emperor, civil wars would certainly have broken out and the empire would have been compromised. During Salim's (Jahangir's) reign good order was maintained in the empire with the exception of several wars in the Deccan and other parts of India, but they did not affect the Mughal rule in any way. One of his sons, Prince Khuram, rebelled against his father but he had to fly to escape condign punishment, while another prince rebelled in Lahore but was defeated, captured and blinded.

After Jahangir's death, Prince Khuram, who took the title of Shahjahan, through the help of his maternal uncle Asaf Khan, got rid of all rivals and obtained peaceful possession of the throne. He reigned for 32 years very ably and peacefully. Indian and European.

historians, as well as European travellers, speak highly of this reign. Mr. S. L. Poole says, in his *Aurangzeb*: "The reign of Shahjahan is notable chiefly for peaceful prosperity. His ministers were men of the highest abilities. Sadullah Allami, a converted Hindu, was the most upright statesman of his age; and Ali Mardan and Asaf Khan were men of approved integrity and energy. The French traveller, Tavernier, speaks of the gracious government of the Emperor as *like that of a father over his family*, and bears witness to the security of the roads and the just administration of the law. A Hindu writer of the time vies with his Muhammadan and Christian contemporaries in extolling the equity of Shahjahan's rule, his wise and liberal administration of the land, the probity of his court-of-law, his personal auditing of the accounts, and the prosperity of the country resulting from all these causes."

The emperor had four sons and three daughters. All the sons were appointed governors of different provinces. To the eldest son, Dara Shukoh, the provinces of Multan, Lahore and Kabul were assigned, but being his father's favourite and heir-apparent he deputed his functions to others and remained with the Emperor. The second son, Shah Shuja, was Governor of Bengal, and the third, Aurangzeb, Governor of the Deccan. The fourth son, Prince Murad Bakhsh, was given charge of the Suba of Gujrat.

Dara was a free-thinker like his great-grandfather, Akbar. He not only tolerated all religions but was more

inclined towards the Hindu religion. He had some Hindu religious books translated into Persian, called Islam and Hinduism twin sisters, and wore about his person jewels engraved with the names of Hindu deities. Orthodox Muslims considered him an apostate.

The second son, Prince Shuja, had the fault of being a slave to his pleasures, otherwise he was very clever and brave and a good statesman.

The fourth, Prince Murad Bakhsh, was as brave as a lion, frank and open as the day, a fool in politics, a despiser of statecraft, and a firm believer in ruddy steel. He was the terror of the battle-field, and the best of good fellows over a battle.

The third, Prince Aurangzeb, was a very good Arabic and Persian scholar. His Persian letters are very much admired by Persian scholars of India. He surpassed in his religious knowledge many 'Mullas' of his age, while in devotion, piety, self-denial, austerity, generosity, magnanimity, charity, strength of purpose, valour, endurance and resignation, he was certainly superior to the generality of mankind. He was an orthodox Muslim of the Sunni sect and considered his eldest brother an apostate and infidel, and according to Muslim law he deserved punishment by death. Aurangzeb knew that Dara's succession to the throne would certainly ruin the cause of Islam in India, so he being a very ardent and orthodox Muslim, was determined from the beginning to put every possible obstacle in Dara's way to the throne. His faith was so firm and

sincere, and his character so decided, that through his long reign, and even throughout his whole life, no act, private or public, ever betrayed any deviation from his convictions and principles. He possessed undaunted courage. It shone forth uniformly in all his actions and conditions of life. For instance, when he was a boy of fourteen, a furious fighting-elephant attacked him. He struck his lance in the beast's face. The animal being still more irritated threw Aurangzeb and his horse by a tremendous blow. The boy got on his feet immediately and aimed another blow at the infuriated animal. He would assuredly have been killed by the animal if timely help had not come from numerous lance-bearers who drove the elephant back by fright and skilful attack. In one of his battles also, when his army was being driven back by the enemy, he ordered his elephant's legs to be chained together that he might not turn his back to the foe.

Two of Shahjahan's daughters, Jahan Ara and Roushan Ara, played some part in the War of Succession. Both being always in the harem with the emperor knew everything that was going on in the palace. Jahan Ara, the elder, always sided with Dara, but the younger, Roushan Ara, was in favour of Aurangzeb and kept him informed of all that was going on in the palace or fort that concerned him.

In the autumn of 1657 Shahjahan fell sick with some serious illness, so he suddenly ceased from attending to State affairs and daily showing himself at the win

dow to receive the Salaams of the populace as was his wont. He took to bed and only his physicians, children and a few trusted nobles had access to him. It was rumoured in the city that he was dead. Dara assumed the government, heard complaints, petitions and state-papers read, dictating orders and signing them as deputy in the name of his father. The mail communication with the distant provinces was suddenly stopped, and all the officials at the court were strictly forbidden to have any correspondence with the other princes in the provinces. The younger princes' three agents who lived at the court were similarly instructed. The daily mail, which brought all official correspondence and news-writers' letters from every part and corner of the empire, was the wheel-work of the machinery of the Mughal government. The rumour of the emperor's death and the interruption of all communication produced great disorder throughout Hindustan. During these political convulsions, Prince Shuja, the Governor of Bengal, assumed independence, made himself crowned king, and started at the head of a powerful army to secure the 'peacock throne' at Agra. The fourth prince, Murad Bakhsh, the Governor of Gujrat, assumed royalty and to enable him to conquer the whole empire he first attacked the rich city of Surat and extorted six lacs of rupees from the merchants of the city.

Aurangzeb, the third brother and Governor of the Deccan, knew all that his brothers knew, but he neither assumed independence nor had himself crowned. His

concern was only about one thing, viz. if the demise of the emperor had really taken place or was likely to take place soon, then Dara, the apostate and infidel being in the capital and in possession of all the imperial forces, treasury, and everything, would easily secure the crown. And then, owing to his inability to govern a vast empire, the peace of the country would come to an end and owing to his heretical views the cause of Islam in India would be ruined. He was deliberating on this subject to find out some means of preventing Dara from usurping the throne. He was well acquainted with the Mughal tradition that only one claimant to the throne should live and the others should die. But Aurangzeb was of quite a different nature. His religious convictions were his ruling principles both in his private life and public career. He never liked to give bodily or mental pain to any creature in the world as far as it could be avoided; while shedding blood was to him horror unspeakable, unless forced to it for the public good. From his letters, actions and words it is unmistakably clear that, in the time of disturbance, it was from religious motives and for the public weal that he intended to bar Dara's path to the throne; but he was most willing to live in peace with his other brothers, and to parcel out the kingdom among themselves after their father's death, which event had either already taken place or was probably very near. He wrote to Murad as well as to Shuja informing them of his views, what he thought proper to do, and soliciting

their co-operation in the great enterprise. He, on the ground of the uncertainty of the news of the emperor's death, blamed his younger brother for the rashness of having himself crowned and attacking the city of Surat. He agreed to give the Punjab, Kashmir and Kabul to Murad, to leave Bengal with some addition to Shuja, and to content himself with the central portion of the Kingdom. Murad was pressing Aurangzeb to march soon, conjointly with him, to overthrow Dara, but he replied that their father was yet living perhaps, therefore they ought simply to go to see their father to find out the true facts about his life and health, and, in case he was living, to pay their respects to him and most humbly and respectfully remonstrate with him against the misdemeanour of Dara and entreat him to put an end to Dara's usurpation of royal power and creating disorder in the Kingdom. Having accomplished this object he hoped to return in peace. In case the emperor, their father, was not living then they ought to be prepared beforehand to meet the emergency in accordance with the situation. These conditions being agreed to, Murad with 10,000 troops started from Ahmedabad, his capital, to join his brother in the Decan in order to proceed with him to Agra.

As the news of Shuja's advance towards Agra with a strong army reached Dara, he informed the emperor of the event and with his permission sent an army under his son Sulaiman Shukoh and the great noble, Maharaja Jai Singh, with many other Umara, to drive Shuja back.

The emperor was very unwilling to start civil war, so he instructed Maharaja Jai Singh, when starting with the expedition, to avoid action as far as possible and to bring the foolish prince by some conciliatory means back to his proper path of duty.

A few weeks later another army was sent under Maharaja Jaswant Singh and Qasim Khan to suppress Murad and cut the line of communication between him and Aurangzeb.

Aurangzeb also prepared his army, and under his son Sultan sent the advance guard which he himself followed shortly after. On reaching Burhanpur he halted and wrote a letter to the emperor begging him to inform his obedient son of the state of his health. He waited in vain a month for a reply. Then he had to start towards Agra. Prince Murad also joined him on the road. When they learnt that Raja Jaswant Singh and Qasim Khan with a strong imperial army were waiting near Ujjain to give them battle and to stop their going to Agra, Aurangzeb sent a Brahmin envoy to Raja Jaswant Singh with a letter and verbal instructions to inform him that he did not intend to wage war; but that, having heard conflicting news about his father's health, was going to see him to set his mind at rest and to pay his respects to him. He therefore wished him to retire and let him go peacefully to Agra. Raja Jaswant Singh refused to comply with his request and prepared for war. Aurangzeb was thus forced to fight, and consequently gave orders to his troops to be ready for

the engagement. A great battle took place near the village of Dharmatpur, in which the imperial force was totally routed and dispersed. The victorious brothers then proceeded towards Agra. When the news of this signal defeat of Dara's army under Jaswant Singh reached the capital, Dara was greatly perplexed. He prepared to lead, in person, a stronger army to defeat the rebel brothers before giving them time to reach Agra. A well-appointed army, 120,000 strong, with a long train of artillery was got ready in a short time. He also wrote urgent letters to his son Sulaiman Shukoh, to patch up peace with Shuja and to hurry back with his troops and join him as he had a more formidable foe to encounter.

The Bengal expeditionary force had already attacked Shuja early one morning near Benares, defeated him and drove him back, his camp, treasures, artillery and ammunition falling into the hands of the victors, who were then slowly pursuing Shuja.

Dara led his splendid army from Agra and reached the river Chambal, near Bharatpur, to prevent the enemy crossing it. Then, having made all arrangements for this object, he learnt, to his great disappointment, that Aurangzeb had given him the slip by making a circuit and crossing the river on the 2nd. of June in spite of the imperial outposts. Now Aurangzeb wrote a letter to Dara asking him to cease hostilities and offered very reasonable conditions for concluding peace. But Dara was inflexible, and, notwithstanding the repeat-

ed requests of Aurangzeb, who pointed out to him the advantages of peace to both parties and the disastrous results of war, Dara could not be persuaded to agree with him. Aurangzeb's army was only 30,000 strong and Murad's 10,000, so both armies combined were only a third of Dara's. Aurangzeb was forced again to fight and the total rout of Dara's forces was the result. In this battle the greater strength of Dara's army at first prevailed and Aurangzeb's troops were driven back, and when no more than one thousand sawars remained around him, being afraid of his elephant's turning back he ordered his legs to be chained. A Rajput chief, intending to throw Aurangzeb down and kill him, attempted to cut the elephant's girths, upon which the prince's body-guard attacked him. Seeing the great valour of the Rajput chief Aurangzeb exclaimed to his men, "Take him alive, such a hero ought not to be killed", but it was too late. This battle field was near the village of Samugarh about six miles from Agra. The Crown-Prince fled to Agra which he reached after sunset and rested in his house. The emperor called him to give him some advice but he excused himself saying that his sense of shame did not allow him to appear in his presence. After resting some hours Dara started for Delhi. The emperor then sent an order to the Governor of Delhi to put all the imperial treasure, stores, stables, ammunition etc at Dara's disposal, and he sent an immense amount of money from Agra fort to him, to enable him to rally there and suppress Aurangzeb.

After Dara's flight from the field, Aurangzeb, according to his usual habit, dismounted from his elephant, prostrated himself upon the ground, and thanked God for the victory. He then attended his brother Murad Bakhsh who, in the battle, had received several wounds in the face. While the surgeons were examining and cleaning Murad's wounds, Aurangzeb rested his brother's head on his thigh, and gently wiped the blood from his face with his sleeve while the wounds were being dressed. He then enjoined the surgeons to treat him most carefully. A considerable amount of booty was allotted to Murad the following day. He then wrote a letter to his father, the emperor, expressing his great regret at the battle he was forced to make. Aurangzeb marched to Agra a few days later and descended in Nur Manzil garden outside the city, from which place he wrote to the emperor on behalf of his elder brother Shuja, begging him to add to Shuja's dominions some districts adjoining Bengal. The latter had long desired to acquire these districts but could not get them. The emperor, wishing to please Aurangzeb, granted his request and issued orders to that effect, which were sent to Shuja through Aurangzeb's man. On hearing Murad complaining of shortness of money he gave him twenty-six lacs of rupees. He thus tried to be reconciled with his brothers and live on friendly terms with them. As there was no discipline among Murad's troops, they began to loot the shops and create disorder in Agra. Aurangzeb being apprised of their

licentiousness sent his son, Prince Sultan, to establish order and punish the offenders. After the interchange of a few letters and verbal messages between the emperor and Aurangzeb, the latter resolved to see his father. But he was secretly informed that the emperor had laid a snare to get him imprisoned or murdered. He therefore changed his mind and did not go to see the emperor. He also learnt that the emperor was secretly helping Dara to recover his lost position. Now Aurangzeb had a very difficult question to solve. Islam enjoins the faithful to honour their parents, to serve and help them with great submission, and never to treat them with the slightest disrespect. There is another Islamic instruction that makes it incumbent upon every Muslim to stop evil by advice and good counsel if possible, otherwise with his hand, *i. e.*, by force; but if he has no opportunity of doing it in either way then he ought at least to resent it. These two texts appear conflicting. According to one passage, showing the slightest opposition to his father's wish was not lawful, while leaving him at liberty to do evil came into conflict with the other text as he had power to stop the evil resulting from the emperor's support of Dara and thus spreading infidelity in the country. Another text of the Quran teaches one to prefer God and his Prophet to one's parents. On this Aurangzeb found out the solution of the problem which appeared at first sight very difficult to solve. He resolved to deprive the emperor of the power of helping the infidel, but to be good

to him in every other way. To effect this object he put the fort in charge of his officers with instructions to cut off all its communication with the outside world. Beyond putting this restriction upon his father Aurangzeb was as dutiful, as submissive and as loving a son as any pious and virtuous man could be. Mr. S. L. Poole speaks of Aurangzeb's behaviour towards his father as follows :

"After this Shahjahan became gradually more reconciled to his captivity, and Aurangzeb did all that was possible to mitigate his distress. He was allowed every enjoyment that his sensuous nature demanded, loaded with presents, and supplied with such amusements as most entertained him. His daughter, the Begum Sahiba, and all his numerous women kept him company. Cooks skilfully ministered to his appetite, and dancers and singing-girls enlivened his senile revels. Like many other aged voluptuary, he became wondrously devout at times, and holy Mullahs came and read the blessed Koran to him. Bernier, who disliked Aurangzeb, says that the indulgence and respect he showed to his captive father were exemplary. He consulted him like an oracle, and there was nothing he would not give him except liberty."

A few passages more from Mr. S. L. Poole's *Aurangzeb* are quoted below in justification of Aurangzeb's behaviour towards his father, when he discovered that Shahjahan was the abettor of Dara in suppressing him (Aurangzeb), and thus to obtain the throne.

"Dara had already fled with a few hundred followers, and his father had sent money and 5000 horsemen to assist him. It was evident that the emperor's sympathies were with his vanquished son, whatever he may have written in the futile hope of throwing dust in the eyes of the very clear-sighted victor. Aurangzeb was not deceived; he had taken his father's measure with great accuracy, and never intended to give him another chance The luxurious old epicure had lost his chance, and exposed his weakness of purpose. To restore such a man to power meant the recall of Dara and the revival of the horrors of civil war. Even to be friendly with him in his palace was to court assassination at the hands of the Imperial guards, or the large and robust Tatar amazons of the seraglio, so Aurangzeb was warned by his faithful sister Roushan Ara. There was but one possible course: the weak-kneed emperor must be made a prisoner. The trap which Shahjahan laid to ensnare his son to his ruin, caught the old king himself. Instead of Aurangzeb coming to be murdered, his son Muhammad entered the fortress on the 18th of June, 1658, overcame the guard and turned the palace into a prison."

Having established his government, and secured order in Agra, Aurangzeb set off towards Delhi in pursuit of Dara. Prince Murad should have accompanied him as he was wont to do, but on the pretext of illness he lagged behind. As there are always, in the courts of princes, flatterers and self-seekers, so there were

many people of this sort in Prince Murad's suite. They took the opportunity of giving false reports and very friendly counsel to the boorish prince, in order to stand higher in his estimation, and to obtain advantage if their counsel prevailed and succeeded. They represented to the prince that both the last two victories were solely due to his own valour and skill, but all the advantages resulting from them were appropriated by Aurangzeb to himself. It was a great injustice. Besides this he deserved the crown much more than his darvesh brother. The prince's vanity, being thus fanned by these flatterers, was greatly excited. He believed everything his passion suggested. Now he resolved to raise his army to more efficient strength, and to win Umara over to his side by granting them higher titles, rewards and salaries. In this way he raised his army from ten to twenty thousand and succeeded in alluring some of Aurangzeb's Umara to his standard. Aurangzeb was not slow to perceive the plot that was being hatched in his dear brother's head. He was not a man to be played upon like this. He was equal to all emergencies, and no man has been known to surpass him in aptitude for finding out proper means and putting them into execution in time to meet any exigency.

When Aurangzeb had been gone two or three days from Agra, Prince Murad hastened after him. He, however, did not join him but halted some miles behind. Aurangzeb understood well what this act meant. One day Aurangzeb found him drunk and contrived to take

him prisoner and sent him to Salimgarh gaol. The court-historians do not mention how he contrived to seize Murad. What other historians say about it is simply guess-work because their statements are conflicting, and none of them was an eye-witness. Bakh-tawar Khan was certainly present at the time but he says nothing about the method by which Murad was ensnared. Manucci and Bernier are chiefly responsible for those slanderous stories about the shameful trick played by Aurangzeb for arresting Murad. I have read a good many Persian histories of Hindustan and Aurangzeb but do not find those scandalous tales in the best authorities on the subject. Only Masum and Isar Das among the native historians deal with this subject in some detail, but the former writing in Bengal and the latter in Gujrat or Malwa had no means of ascertaining what was passing in Agra or Delhi, and do not mention the name of any eye-witness or reliable authority from whom they received their information. Their sources of information were only distorted rumours and bazaar gossip swollen in transit and therefore of no value at all. Khafi Khan, being the son of a great favourite of Murad's and therefore not partial to Aurangzeb, did not find those stories worth mentioning in his work, nor could his father, who was an eye-witness of the event, enlighten his son who was most curious about the subject. Khafi Khan would not have spared Aurangzeb if he had found such faults in him, as in his book he always shows himself his impartial critic. He

passed adverse remarks on his hero wherever he found the slightest ground justifying them. Khafi Khan is to Aurangzeb what Badauni is to Akbar,—his historian and severe critic.

Dara, hearing of Aurangzeb's march from Agra towards Delhi, left the city and hastened to reach Lahore where his own deputy was conducting the affairs of that province.

Aurangzeb, reaching Delhi, was crowned on the 21st of July, 1658, and assumed the title of Alamgir. He then went in pursuit of Dara, and chased him to Multan whence he fled to Sukkur in Sindh. When King Alamgir reached Multan he heard, through news-writers' letters from Bengal, that Shuja, hearing of Alamgir's departure from Delhi in pursuit of Dara, had set out from Bengal with a large army to seize Agra. The King at first could not believe the news as he had shown great favour towards Shuja, and on his first reaching Agra had obtained from the Emperor several districts for him. But similar news reaching him daily from different persons and different quarters corroborated the story. The King, leaving Dara's affair to some of his Umara in command of about ten or twelve thousand sawars, hurried back with his usual energy to Delhi, which he reached by forced marches day and night about the 20th. of November. He then despatched a strong force under his son, Muhammad Sultan, to oppose Shuja. He himself marched slowly and stopped for some days at Soron, a place situated in a

hunting-ground. He sent a letter to Shuja advising him to desist from hostilities. He hoped to persuade him by reasonable arguments to return to friendly relations, and then he expected to return soon to the capital, Agra. But in spite of repeatedly writing to Shuja for peace, he was disappointed. So finding him inflexible he set out for Bengal with a great army. On nearing the tank of Khajwa where Shuja's camp then was, he drew up his army in battle array. All the divisions were ordered to keep their positions, and to pass the night without taking off their armour, or unsaddling their horses. The following day the battle was to take place. Raja Jaswant Singh, in command of the right wing of Aurangzeb's army, had secretly conspired with Shuja to overthrow Aurangzeb by a treacherous plan. He was to attack the army in the rear while Shuja was to attack it from the front and thus to crush Aurangzeb between two forces acting from opposite directions. The Raja with his 14,000 Rajputs just after midnight of the day preceding the battle, fell upon other divisions of the army, massacring, plundering and dispersing them. They were thus taken unawares by the very people upon whose support they had counted and relied, but who suddenly turned hostile. It is not difficult to imagine what amount of mischief in such a conjuncture of circumstances can accrue. But as Shuja did not turn up, the Rajputs having made great havoc in the army turned towards Hindustan, many half-hearted men besides Rajputs also deserted with them, and owing

to their spreading the rumour that Shuja was sure to overcome many went over to his side. Aurangzeb was at that time busy with his prayers. When the fact was reported to him he did not betray any signs of surprise, indignation, fear or despair. He came out of his tent and spoke to the Umara that had gathered around him, saying "Be of good cheer. God has signalled His favour to us and our cause by timely winning foes from friends, for if the traitor had acted like this during an action our cause would have been irretrievably lost. Thank God that He has done what is good for us." Thus putting heart into his dispirited men, he proceeded to reform the disorganised army, and having completed this he advanced upon the enemy. A great battle was fought. Aurangzeb's troops were beaten back by the violent attacks of the enemy and the charges of their furious war-elephants. There were scarcely two thousand men left around him, but he soon won the battle and his enemies were totally routed and put to flight. He then left Mir Jumla and his son Sultan to pursue Shuja, while he turned towards Delhi. He also sent a division, under Muhammad Amin Khan, to Marwar to punish the traitor Jaswant Singh and to put Rai Singh Rathour, his cousin, in his place as Raja of Jodhpur.

Dara Shukoh, flying before the pursuing columns of Aurangzeb from Multan to Sukkur, thence to Thatta and Cutch, came lastly to Gujrat where he was favourably received by the Governor Shah Nawaz Khan.

Here he got money and stores again. He then set about enlisting recruits, raised a large army in a short time and started towards Ajmer.

It was hardly to be expected that Aurangzeb would condone the abominable treason of Raja Jaswant Singh at Khajwa. If he had simply deserted Aurangzeb it would not have mattered much in the light of Indian politics of those days, but he aimed at Aurangzeb's destruction, killed his men and plundered his camp at the time when he had just completed his preparations for giving battle to his most formidable enemy and rival.

So the Raja, fearing his own destruction which he thought was inevitable, sought Dara's alliance in the faint hope of the possibility of the allied armies, Rajputs and Mughals, prevailing and coming off victorious. In this hope he wrote to Dara, who was then at Gujrat, of his resolution to join him, with all his forces and resources, in the war with Aurangzeb. On receiving his letter Dara was extremely delighted, and thought that his fortune had turned when such powerful support was so unexpectedly and providentially vouchsafed him. He eagerly accepted the offer and set off immediately for Ajmer.

But Raja Jaswant Singh was greatly mistaken in his estimate of Aurangzeb's character. He was always ready to forgive his enemies and great offenders unless by doing so public peace was compromised or some rightful complainant denied justice. He did not forgive the princes of royal blood, including his own sons, be

cause he knew that they were absolutely incorrigible. Their motto was 'Either crown or glorious tomb', no other alternative was possible to them. When a subject demanded justice Aurangzeb had no power or rather will to save the offender. With the exception of these two cases Aurangzeb was mercy personified. If Jaswant Singh had asked Aurangzeb's pardon at any time after perpetrating that atrocious outrage he would certainly have obtained it without the intercession of any friends. However, Jaswant Singh did not directly beg Aurangzeb to forgive him, but he either wrote secretly to Raja Jai Singh to intercede with the king, or Jai Singh himself took interest in his cause, for he represented to Aurangzeb that Jaswant Singh was in extreme distress on account of the crime he had committed, and that if he would be pleased to pardon him he would in future serve him loyally. On this, absolute amnesty was granted to Jaswant Singh. The generous king did not even demand his presence at court, for he knew that his conscience being stricken by his recent shameful deed he had not the face to show himself there. He therefore appointed him Governor of Gujrat and permitted him to join his post without coming to the court. Such clemency, apparently foolish and void of ordinary precaution, was rare in those days and would be rare even in these if occasions arose.

So Raja Jaswant Singh did not join Dara though the latter tried his best to induce him to fulfil his promise.

Dara was again defeated at Ajmer by Aurangzeb.

Shaikh Mir, one of the greatest and best generals of Aurangzeb, was killed in this battle. Shah Nawaz Khan, who not long before had been appointed Subadar of Gujrat by Aurangzeb, actually surrendered the province and himself to Dara when he was last at Ahmadabad. He now fought on Dara's side at Ajmer and was killed. Aurangzeb ordered funeral honours to be paid to the bodies of both generals and they were buried with equal honours in the enclosure of Saint Christ's tomb.

After his defeat Dara fled towards Sindh intending to go through Kandahar to Persia, but being captured by an Afghan was, by Aurangzeb's generals, who were pursuing him in Sindh, brought back in chains to Delhi, where he was paraded through the streets to let the people see that he was really taken prisoner. This act on the part of Aurangzeb looks rather cruel and harsh, but in those days such a proceeding was as necessary as capturing him. In spite of this precaution a counterfeit Dara appeared three years later in Baluchistan, and having collected some men began to make raids into Aurangzeb's territory. After Shuja's disappearance from India a sham Shuja also appeared and produced some mischief. The people who understood Indian ways regarded the act of parading Dara through Delhi as wise policy. Some of the common people, being moved by his extreme humiliation and misery, revolted and rioted in the city. Many were killed and wounded. Dara's case was then submitted to a council of *ulamas*

and nobles for deliberation and decision. After some discussion a great majority decided that Dara was an apostate and according to Islamic law should be put to death. The following day Dara was executed and his body was buried in Nizamudddin's tomb.

All the many false and fictitious stories of the scene told by Bernier, Tavernier and Manucci ought to be rejected. Some go so far as to say that the severed head of Dara being brought to Aurangzeb he contemptuously trampled it under foot, thereupon the head laughed Ha! ha! ha!

Shuja in Bengal was chased, by Aurangzeb's generals, to Arakan and disappeared for ever.

Dara's elder son, Sulaiman Shukoh, was seized and imprisoned in Gwalior Fort.

Prince Murad Bakhsh was also in the State-prison of Gwalior with his concubine, the most beloved Sarson Bai, a liberal pension being allowed him. There were many Mughals and others devoted to him who, since his imprisonment, lived round about the fort, and he supported them with money out of his pension and sent them cooked food also from inside the fort. Among Murad's most devoted friends was the great historian Khafi Khan's father, who lived close under the walls of the fort. He contrived a rope ladder to be fastened to a window of the fort and informed Murad of the plan for his escape. The crying of his beloved concubine at the hour of parting awoke the guards who made a search. The ladder was discovered and the supervision

of the fort was thenceforward made more strict.

This was the only step Aurangzeb took. Nobody was otherwise punished as he only took cognizance of actual facts, and in this case no one escaped nor was any harm done.

When Prince Murad was Governor in Gujrat he had, at the instigation of some of his dishonest favourites, put to death a very just and honest official, Diwan Ali Naqi Khan. These favourites forged a letter in the Diwan's name to Shahjahan charging the prince with certain faults, and thus they showed to Murad as if it had fallen accidentally into their hands. This Diwan had two sons. The younger of them, seeing the prince fallen into disgrace and Aurangzeb extremely strict in justice, lodged a complaint against the prince and claimed vengeance for his father's blood. Aurangzeb directed the complainant to lodge his complaint in the court of the Qazi of Gwalior. The case was tried there and the prince, being found guilty, was executed. As Aurangzeb could not show partiality to any party in lawsuits, he could not prevent Ali Naqi's younger son from prosecuting Murad, but his subsequent act of bestowing a *mansab* upon the elder son who refused to claim vengeance for his father's blood, revealed his sentiments about the matter. The younger son, who persisted in having his claims satisfied, was shown no favour at all.

Aurangzeb's eldest son Muhammad Sultan with several of his men, when fighting Shuja in Bengal, one

night went over secretly to his uncle Shuja,—prompted by some motive which is not clearly known. He fought on his side some weeks and then came back secretly to his father's camp. He was put into prison for this act of treason and died there after several years. None of his companions-in-crime were punished except one noble who, suspected of being his accomplice, was temporarily deprived of his rank, but was soon restored to his former dignity. Such policy seems strange in the light of present politics but they were quite reasonable and just then. A prince of royal blood could create much disturbance in the country if he willed but other people could not do so, therefore their punishment was not of such moment.

There is some difference of opinion among historians as to what the prince's motive was for going over to his father's enemy. Some say that he could not bear Mir Jumla's superiority in command. Others think that his love for Shuja's daughter to whom he was betrothed, induced him to commit the rash deed which cost him his lifelong liberty, ending in premature death.



CHAPTER III.

I wish, by a brief but sufficiently convincing method, only to exculpate Aurangzeb from false accusations and imputations. I first cite here, from some English historians of note, a few remarks in which they agree with Indian historians on the good qualities of Aurangzeb. I shall next quote from the same authors the principal charges laid against him and show their baselessness by tangible proofs; and moreover by citing analogous facts from the histories of great European sovereigns, I shall show that the Mughal government, even in its apparently weak and vulnerable points, was superior to those of the said sovereigns. I shall in a subsequent chapter mention a few of Aurangzeb's defects that foreign historians have failed to comprehend and point out clearly.

I begin with Mr. S. L. Poole, Aurangzeb's most moderate and indulgent critic.

"All Muhammadan writers extol him as a saint; all contemporary Christians, except Dryden,—and he was not a historian—denounce him as a hypocrite who used religion as a cloak for ambition, and said prayers to cover the most unnatural murders. Aurangzeb has experienced the fate of his great contemporary, Cromwell, whom he resembled in many features of the soul. He has had his Ludlow among his biographers,

and his Baxter, with their theories of selfish ambition and virtue vitiated by success; he has also been slavered with the panegyrics of Muhammadan Flecknoes and Dawleneys. These opposite views, however, are less contradictory than might be supposed. They merely represent the difference between Christian bigotry and Muhammadan bigotry."

"Aurangzeb, in his heart, was at least as humanely disposed as the gentleman Sultan of Turkey, but he had equal reason to dread the ambitious tempers of his brothers and kindred. His forefathers had suffered from the rebellions of their nearest relations. Akbar had to fight his brother; Jahangir rebelled against his father, and in return was resisted by his own eldest son, who was condemned to pass his life in prison, where he was a perpetual anxiety to the government; Shahjahan had defied his father and came to the throne through the blood of his brother Shahriar. With such warning Aurangzeb could expect no peace whilst Dara, Shuja, and Murad Bakhsh lived. Each of them had as good a right to the throne as he had himself, for there was no law of succession among Mughal princes; and each of them unmistakably intended to grasp the sceptre if he could. Aurangzeb might indeed have renounced the dream of power, and reverted to the ascetic ideal of his youth: but Dara and Shuja were infidels or heretics whom it was his duty, as a true Muslim, to drive from the throne; more, the lust of power was hot in his blood; besides, the prince-fakir

would never have been safe from the knives of his brothers agents '.

"The hostile criticisms of travellers regard chiefly Aurangzeb's conduct as prince to his acts as emperor they manifest little true admiration. Throughout his long reign of nearly fifty years no single deed of cruelty has been proved against him. Even his persecution of the Hindus, which was of a piece with his puritanical character, was admittedly marked with no executions or tortures. Hypocrite as he was called no instance of his violating the precepts of the religion he professed has ever been produced, nor is there the smallest evidence that he ever forced his conscience.

"Aurangzeb was first and last a stern puritan. No thing in life—neither throne, nor love, nor ease—weighed for an instant in his mind against his fealty to the principles of Islam. For religion he persecuted the Hindus and destroyed their temples while he damaged his exchequer by abolishing the time-honoured tax on the religious festivals and fairs of the unbelievers. Religion induced Aurangzeb to abjure the pleasures of the senses as completely as if he had indeed become the Fakir he once desired to be.

"Even the English merchants of Surat who had their own reasons for disliking the Emperor could only tell Ovington that Aurangzeb was a zealous professor of Islam never neglecting the hours of devotion nor anything which in his sense may denominate him a sincere believer.

“Aurangzeb might have cast the precepts of Muhammad to the winds and still kept—nay, strengthened—his hold of the sceptre of Hindustan. After the general slaughter of his rivals, his seat on the peacock throne was as secure as ever had been Shahjahan's or Jahangir's. They held their power in spite of flagrant violations of the law of Islam; they abandoned themselves to voluptuous ease, to ‘Wein, Weib, and Gesang’, and still their empire held together; even Akbar, model of Indian sovereigns, owed much of his success to his open disregard of the Muhammadan religion. The empire had been governed by men of the world, and their government had been good. There was nothing but his own conscience to prevent Aurangzeb from adopting the eclectic philosophy of Akbar, the luxurious profligacy of Jahangir, or the splendid ease of Shahjahan. The Hindus would have preferred anything to a Muhammadan bigot. Probably any other Mughal Prince would have followed in the steps of the kings, his forefathers, and emulated the indolence and vice of the court in which he had received his earliest impressions.”

“All this he did out of no profound scheme of policy, but from sheer conviction of right. Aurangzeb was born with an indomitable resolution. He had early formed his ideal of life, and every spring of his vigorous will was stretched at full tension in the effort to attain it. His was no ordinary courage. That he was physically brave is only to say he was a Mughal prince of

the old lion-hearted stock. But he was among the bravest even in their valiant ranks. In the crisis of the campaign in Balkh, when the enemy like locusts and ants hemmed him in on every side, and steel was clashing all around him, the setting sun heralded the hour of evening prayer : Aurangzeb, unmoved amid the din of battle, dismounted and bowed himself on the bare ground in the complicated ritual of Islam, as composedly as if he had been performing the *riks* in the mosque at Agra. The king of the Usbeks noted the action, and exclaimed, 'To fight with such a man is self-destruction !' In the decisive battle with Dara, when the fortune of the day seemed cast against him, and only a small band surrounded him, he revived the courage of his wavering troops by a simple but typical act : he ordered his elephant's legs to be chained together."

"When stricken with an agonising malady the emperor never lost sight of his duty. From his sick-bed he directed the affairs of his kingdom, and, as Bernier records, with the wonder of an experienced physician."

"Nor was such contempt of danger and pain limited to his younger days. The old Emperor in his last campaigns in the Deccan shared the perils and hardships of the common soldier and recklessly exposed himself to the enemy's sharp-shooters."

"Aurangzeb was not only brave in face of danger and in battling with bodily weakness : he had an invincible moral courage,—the courage of the man who dares to act unflinchingly up to his convictions. Akbar

had adopted the solar year of the Persians, and had authorised the celebration of the *Nauroz* or New-Year's-Festival, a characteristic national institution of Persia. One of Aurangzeb's earliest acts after his accession was to prohibit the *Nauroz* and revert to the clumsy lunar reckoning of orthodox Mohamedans. In vain did scholars and mathematicians point out the inconvenience of the lunar methods, with its shifting months, for the purpose of administration, collection of revenue, regulation of seasons, harvests, and a thousand other matters. All these things were patent to a man of Aurangzeb's shrewd intelligence, but they weighed nothing against the fact that the lunar system was the Kalendar of Muhammad the Prophet, and whatever Muhammad the Prophet ordered should be law whilst Aurangzeb was king."

"In matters of religion the Emperor was obstinate to the point of fanaticism. In other matters he displayed the wisdom and judgment of a clear and thoughtful mind. As he had his ideal of faith which he fought for *a outrance*; so had he his standard of kingly duty and his theory of the education of princes for the responsibilities of government."

"No man, says Bernier, can be more alive than Aurangzeb to the necessity of storing the minds of princes, destined to rule nations, with useful knowledge. As they surpass others in power and elevation, so ought they, he says, to be pre-eminent in wisdom and virtue. He is very sensible that the cause of the misery which

cause me no solicitude, that in devising means to promote it I should never pass a sleepless night, nor spare a single day from the pursuit of some low and sensual gratification. According to him I am to be swayed by considerations of my bodily health, and chiefly to study what may best administer to my personal peace and enjoyment. No doubt he would have me abandon the government of the vast kingdoms to some *Vizier*; he seems not to consider that, being born the son of a king and placed on the throne, I was sent into the world by Providence to live and labour, not for myself, but for others; that it is my duty not to think of my own happiness, except as far as it is inseparably connected with the happiness of my people. It is the repose and prosperity of my subjects that it behoves me to consult; nor are these to be sacrificed to anything besides the demands of justice, the maintenance of the royal authority, and the security of the State. This man cannot penetrate into the consequences of the intertness he recommends, and he is ignorant of the evils that attend upon delegated power. It was not without reasons that our great Sadi emphatically exclaimed, 'Cease to be king! Oh, cease to be king! or determine that your dominions shall be governed by yourself.'"

"This ideal of kingship accords with the tenor of the numerous letters which have been preserved from Aurangzeb's correspondence. In one of these, addressed to his captive father, he says:—

‘Almighty God bestows his trusts upon him who
 ‘discharges the duty of cherishing his subjects and
 ‘protecting the people It is manifest and clear to the
 ‘wise that a wolf is no fit shepherd neither can a faint-
 ‘hearted man carry out the great duty of government
 ‘Sovereignty is the guardianship of the people, not
 ‘self-indulgence and profligacy The Almighty will
 ‘deliver your humble servant from all feelings of
 ‘remorse as regards your majesty.’”

“He made it absolutely clear to Shahjahan that his
 usurping son would suffer no sentiment of filial piety to
 stand between him and his duty to the people.

‘I wish to avoid your censure’ he wrote in another
 ‘letter to his father. “and cannot endure that you
 ‘should form a wrong estimate of my character. My
 ‘elevation to the throne has not, as you imagine, filled
 ‘me with insolence and pride You know from more
 ‘than forty years’ experience, how burthensome an
 ‘ornament a crown is, and with how sad and aching a
 ‘heart a monarch retires from the public gaze . You
 ‘seem to think that I ought to devote less time and
 ‘attention to the consolidation and security of the
 ‘kingdom, and that it would better become me to devise
 ‘and execute plans of aggrandisement I am indeed
 ‘far from denying that conquests ought to distinguish
 ‘the reign of a great monarch, and that I should dis-
 ‘grace the blood of the great Timur, our honoured
 ‘progenitor, if I did not seek to extend the bounds of
 ‘my present territories. At the same time I cannot be

‘reproached with inglorious inaction.... I wish you to
 ‘recollect that the greatest conquerors are not always
 ‘the greatest kings. The nations of the earth have
 ‘often been subjugated by mere uncivilised barbarians,
 ‘and the most extensive conquests have in a few short
 ‘years crumbled to pieces. He is the truly great king
 ‘who makes it the chief business of his life to govern
 ‘his subjects with equity.’”

“All we know of his methods of government however, goes to prove that his fine sentiments were really the ruling principles of his life. No act of injustice, according to the law of Islam, has been proved against him. Ovington, whose personal authority is worth little, as he derived his opinions and information from Aurangzeb’s least partial critics,—the English merchants at Bombay and Surat,—says that the Great Mughal is the main ocean of justice. He generally determines with exact justice and equity, for there is no pleading of peerage or privilege before the Emperor; but the meanest man is as soon heard by Aurangzéb as the chief amir, which makes the *umara* very circumspect of their actions and punctual in their payments. The native chronicler, already quoted, has told us that the emperor was a mild and painstaking judge, easy of approach, and gentle of manners; and the same character is given him by Dr. Careri who saw him in the Deccan in 1695.”

“Soon after his accession to the throne he found that the late devastating movements of the contending armies, combined with a drought, had produced a famine.

in the land. He at once established houses for the distribution of free dinners, and ordered the remission of about eighty taxes including the vexatious high way and ferry tolls, the ground cess on houses, shops etc. Other taxes such as those on Hindu and Mohamedan fairs, licenses for spirits, gambling-hells, and houses of ill fame were probably abolished from religious motives the puritan would not take toll for iniquity. But the rest could only have been remitted for the sake of helping the necessitous population.

"Aurangzeb was served by a large staff of official reporters called *Waki Nawis*, such as his forefathers had also employed. These men who were locally too well known to merit the opprobrious title of spies, sent regular letters from all the chief places in the provinces to keep the great Mughal informed of all that went on in the most distant as well as the nearest districts. Their news-letters often brought information of the most important nature to the court, but they also communicated the most trifling events and conversations that came under the writer's notice. These correspondents were of course liable to be bribed by dishonest governors, and doubtless often suppressed what they should have reported, but they acted as a salutary check upon the local officials. They were in fact Crown-Inspectors, and were held in some dread by corrupt administrators and landowners. By their aid Aurangzeb was able to exercise his passion for business, to examine the minute details of administration,

and to exercise his patronage down to the appointment of the merest clerk."

"His father, Shahjahan, in his graceful, indolent, selfish old age, even more than in his vigorous prime, was *pater patrial*, adored of his subjects. Aurangzeb was incomparably his father's superior—a wiser man, a juster king, a more clement and benevolent ruler; his greatest calumniator, Manucci, admits that his heart was really kind; yet all his self-restraint, his sense of duty, his equity, and laborious care of his people, counted for nothing in their heart against his cold reserve and distrust."

"It has been usual to call the character of Aurangzeb a puzzling compound of contradictions. Yet there is no inconsistency in his acts or words. His character is that of the puritan, with all its fiery zeal, its ascetic restraint, its self-denial, its uncompromising tenacity of righteous purpose, its high ideals of conduct and duty; and also with its cold severity, its curbed impulses, its fanaticism, its morbid distrust of poor human nature, its essential unlovableness. Aurangzeb possessed many great qualities, he practised all the virtues; but he was lacking in the one thing needful in a leader of men: he could not win love. Such a one may administer an empire, but he cannot rule the hearts of men." (S. L. Poole's *Aurangzeb*.)

Now I quote below some remarks made by Alexander Dow, in his History of India,; on Aurangzeb's character and government.

"The war with Shuja, which was carried on in the extremity of the Empire, neither disturbed the repose of Aurangzeb, nor diverted his attention from the civil affairs of the State. Impartial and decisive in his measures, he was even acknowledged to be a good prince by those who recognised not his right to the throne, and men began to wonder, how he, who was so just, could be cruel. The people suffered little by the civil war. The damage by the marching and counter-marching of armies was paid out of the public treasury. An exact discipline had been observed by all parties ; for the rivals, for the crown of Hindustan though in the field against one another, could not persuade themselves that they were in an enemy's country. The prince who prevailed in a province, extended not the punishment of treason to those who supported a competitor with their swords ; and, what is scarce credible, not one man beyond the family of Timur, was either assassinated in private or slain by hands of public justice, during a civil war so long, so bloody, and so various in its events."

"The Emperor, accustomed to business in his long government of various provinces, was well acquainted with the whole detail of public affairs. Nothing was so minute as to escape his notice. He knew that the power and consequence of the prince depended upon the prosperity and happiness of the people ; and he was even from selfish views an enemy to oppression, and encourager of agriculture and commercial industry. He established a perfect security of property over all

his dominions. The forms of justice were made less intricate and more expeditious than in former reigns. To corrupt a judge was rendered for the first time a crime. The fees paid in the courts of justice were ascertained with accuracy and precision; and a delay in the execution of justice subjected the judge to the payment of the loss sustained by the party aggrieved."

"The course of appeals from inferior to superior courts was uninterrupted and free; but to prevent a wanton exertion on this privilege, the appellant was severely fined when his complaint against a judgment was found frivolous and ill-founded. The distributors of public justice, when their decrees were reversed, could not always screen themselves under the pretended errors in judgment. Should the matter appear clear, they were turned out of their offices as swayed by partiality. Aurangzeb soon after his accession to the throne, established a precedent of this kind. The decision had been unjust. He sent for the judge and told him in public 'This matter is clear and obvious, and if you have no ability to perceive it in that light, you are unfit for the place, as a weak man; if you suffered yourself to be overcome by presents, you are an unjust man, and therefore unworthy of your office.' Having thus reprimanded the judge, he divested him of his employment, and dismissed him with ignominy from his presence."

"In the midst of this public joy, the news of a dreadful calamity was received at court. A prodigious

famine, occasioned by the uncommon drought of the season which burnt up the harvest, prevailed in different parts of India. The emperor exerted himself with humanity—a contrast to his behaviour towards his own family—to alleviate the distress of his subjects. He remitted the taxes that were due, he employed those already collected in the purchase of corn, which was distributed among the poorer sort. He even expended immense sums out of the treasury in conveying grain by land as well as by water into the interior provinces from Bengal and the countries which lay on the five branches of the Indus, as having suffered less on account of the great rivers by which they are watered. The grain so conveyed was purchased at any price, with the public money, and it was resold at a very moderate rate. The poorer sort were supplied at fixed places, with a certain quantity without any consideration whatever. The activity of the Emperor and his wise regulations, carried relief through every corner of his dominions. Whole provinces were delivered from pending destruction, and many millions of lives were saved.

"This humane attention to the safety of his subjects obliterated from their minds all objections to his former conduct. The ambition, which made him wade through blood to the throne, inclined him to the pursuit of fame, which can only be acquired by virtue. No man observes a Persian author, 'is tyrant for the sake of evil. Passion perverts the judgment, a wrong judgment begets opposition, and opposition is the cause of

cruelty, bloodshed, and civil war. When all opposition is conquered, the sword of vengeance is sheathed, and the destroyer of mankind becomes the guardian of the human species'. Such are the reflections of a writer who published the history of Aurangzeb in the heart of his court; and that they were just appears from his having the boldness to make them. To alleviate the calamity which had fallen on the people, was the principal, if not the sole business of the emperor during the first year of his reign. A favourable season succeeded to his care; and the empire soon wore its former face of prosperity."

"The progress of the prince did not obstruct the necessary business of the State. Attended by all his officers, the decisions of each department were carried from the camp to every corner of the empire. Expresses stood ready on horseback at every stage; and imperial mandates were despatched to the various provinces as soon as they were sealed in the tent of audience. The nobles, as was customary in the capital, daily attended the presence; and the appeals were discussed every morning as regularly as when the emperor remained at Delhi. The petitioners followed the court; and a small allowance from the public treasury was assigned to them, as a compensation for their additional expenses incurred by attending the imperial camp. In this manner Aurangzeb arrived at Kashmir. The beauty, the cool and salubrious air of that country, induced him to relax his mind for a short time from

business. He wandered over its charming valley, seeking a variety of pleasures, and he soon recovered that vigour of constitution which his attention to public business, as well as his late sickness, had greatly impaired. A general peace was now established over all the empire. Aurangzeb, to whom business was amusement, employed himself in making salutary regulations for the benefit of his subjects. He loved money, because it was the foundation of power, and he encouraged industry and commerce, as they increased his revenue. He himself, in the meantime, led the life of a hermit, in the midst of a court unequalled in its splendour. The pomp of State, he found from experience, was not necessary to establish the power of a prince of abilities, and he avoided its trouble as he liked not its vanity. He, however, encouraged magnificence among his officers at court, and his deputies in the provinces. They were made to understand that the ample allowance, granted to them from the revenue, was not to be hoarded up for their private use. 'The money is the property of the empire' said Aurangzeb, 'and it must be employed in giving weight to those who execute the laws.'

"An opportunity offered itself to his magnificence and generosity in the beginning of the eleventh year of his reign. Abdullah, King of the Lesser Balkh and lineally descended from the great Changiz, having abdicated the throne in favour of his son, advanced into Tibet on his way to Mecca. He sent a message to

Aurangzeb, requesting permission for himself and his retinue to pass through India. The emperor ordered the Governor of Kashmir to receive the royal pilgrims with all imaginable pomp, and to supply them with every article of luxury and convenience at public expense. The governors of districts, with all their followers, were commanded to attend Abdullah from province to province. The troops in every place through which he was to pass, were directed to pay him all military honours; and in this manner, he advanced to Delhi, and was received by the Emperor at the gates of the city. Having remained seven months at the capital, he was conducted with the same pomp and magnificence to Surat, where he embarked for Arabia."

"Aurangzeb's dress was always plain and simple. He wore, upon festival days only, cloth-of-gold adorned with jewels. He, however, changed his dress twice a day, being remarkably cleanly in his person. When he rose in the morning he plunged into the bath and then retired for a short time to pray. Religion suited the serious turn of his mind; and he at last became an enthusiast through habit. In his youth he never stirred abroad on Friday; and should he happen to be in the field, or on a hunting party, he suspended all business and diversions. Zealous for the faith of Muhammad, he rewarded proselytes with a liberal hand, though he did not choose to persecute those of different persuasions in matters of religion."

"He carried his austerity and regard for morality into the throne. He made strict laws against vices of every kind. He was severe against adultery and fornication; and against certain unnatural crimes he issued various edicts. In the administration of justice, he was indefatigable, vigilant and exact. He sat almost every day in judgment, and he chose men of virtue, as well as remarkable for their knowledge of the law, for his assessors. When the cause appeared intricate it was left to the examination of the bench of judges, in their common and usual court. They were to report upon any such cause as originated before the throne, and the Emperor, after weighing their reasons with caution, pronounced judgment and determined the suit."

crime, they were restored to favour ; the most guilty were banished for life."

"Capital punishments were almost totally unknown under Augrngzeb. The adherents of his brothers, who contended with him for the empire, were freely pardoned when they laid down their arms. When they appeared in his presence, they were received as new subjects, not as inveterate rebels. Naturally mild and moderate through policy, he seemed to forget that they had not been always his friends. When he appeared in public, he clothed his features with a complacent benignity which pleased all. Those who had trembled at his name, from the fame of his rigid justice, when they saw him, found themselves at ease. They could express themselves, in his preseuce, with the greatest freedom and composure. His affability gave to them confidence ; and he secured to himself their esteem by the strict impartiality of his decisions."

"His long experience in business, together with the acuteness and retentiveness of his mind, rendered him master even of the detail of the affairs of the empire. He remembered the rents, he was thoroughly acquainted with the wages of every particular district. He was wont to write down in his pocket-book everything that occurred to him through the day. He formed a systematic knowledge of everything concerning that revenue, from his notes, to which, upon every necessary occasion he recurred. The governors of the provinces, and even the collectors in their districts, when he examined

either on the state of their respective department, were afraid of misrepresentation or ignorance. The first ruined them for ever; the latter turned them out of their offices."

' His public buildings partook of the temper of his own mind. They were rather useful than splendid. At every stage from Kabul to Auringabad, from Gujarat to Bengal, through the city of Agra, he built houses for the accommodation of travellers. These were maintained at the public expense. They were supplied with wood, with cooking utensils, with a certain quantity of rice and other provisions. The houses, which his predecessors had erected on byroads, were repaired, bridges were built over the small rivers, and boats furnished for crossing the large ones."

sure. He wrote often to the learned in every corner of his dominions, with his own hand. He called them to court and placed them, according to their abilities, in offices of State; those who were versed in the commentaries on the Quran, were raised to the dignity of judges, in the different courts of justice."

"Aurangzeb was as experienced in war as he was in the arts of peace. Though his personal courage was almost unparalleled, he always endeavoured to conquer more by stratagem than by force. To succeed by art threw honour upon himself; to subdue by force acquired fame for others. Such was his coolness in action, that at the rising and setting of the sun, the times appointed for prayers, he never neglected to attend to that duty, though in the midst of battle. Devout to excess he never engaged in action without prayer, and for every victory he ordered a day of thanksgiving, and one of festivity and joy."

"In the art of writing Aurangzeb excelled in an eminent degree. He wrote many letters with his own hand; and he corrected always the diction of his secretaries. He never permitted a letter of business to be despatched without critically examining it himself. He was versed in Persian and Arabic. He wrote the language of his ancestors, the Mughals, and all the various dialects of India. In his diction he was concise and nervous; and he reduced all his despatches to a brevity and precision which prevented all misconstruction and perplexity."

"Though not remarkable for his strength of body, he was extremely active in the exercises of the field. He was an excellent archer, he threw the lance with grace, and he was so good a horseman that few men durst follow him in the chase. He understood the use of firearms so well that he shot deer on full speed from his horse. When wandering over the country in pursuit of game he did not forget the concerns of the State. He examined the nature of the soil, he enquired even of common labourers concerning its produce. He understood and therefore encouraged agriculture. He issued an edict that the rents should not be raised on those who, by their industry, had improved their farms. He mentioned, in the edict, that such a practice was at once unjust and impolitic; that it checked the spirit of improvement, and impoverished the State; 'and what pleasure' said he 'can Aurangzeb have in possessing wealth in the midst of public distress'."

"Though he entertained many women, according to the custom of his country, it was only for state. He contented himself with his lawful wives, and these only in succession; when one either died or became old. He spent very little time in the apartments of his women. He rose every morning at the dawn of day, and went into the bathing chamber, which communicated with the private chapel, to which he retired for half-an-hour for prayers. Returning to his apartment from the chapel he spent half-an-hour in reading some book of devotion, and then went into the harem to dress. He

entered the chamber of justice generally about seven o'clock, and there sat with the judges, read petitions, and decided cases till nine. Justice was dispensed in a summary manner, and rewards and punishments were immediate; the decisions which were not clear, having been already weighed by the judges in their own court, were sent down for reinvestigation."

"The people in general had access to the chamber of justice; and there had an opportunity of laying their grievances and distresses before their sovereign. Aurangzeb ordered always a sum of money to be placed by his side on the bench; and he relieved the necessitous with his own hand. Large sums were in this manner expended every day; and as the court was open to all, the unfortunate found invariably a resource in the Imperial bounty."

"The Emperor retired at nine to breakfast, and continued for an hour with his family. He then came forth into a balcony which faced the great square. He sat there to review his elephants, which passed before him in gorgeous caparisons. He sometimes amused himself with battles between tigers and leopards; sometimes with those of gazelles, elks, and variety of ferocious animals. On particular days squadrons of horse passed in review. The fine horses of his own stable were also brought, at times, before him with all their magnificent trappings, mounted by his grooms, who exhibited various feats of horsemanship. The balcony in which he sat was called 'The place of pri-

.

vacy' as it looked from the harem, and the ladies saw everything from behind their screens of gauze."

"An hour being spent at this amusement, the Emperor, generally about eleven o'clock, made his appearance in the great hall of audience. There all the nobles were ranged, before the throne, in two lines according to their dignity."

"Aurangzeb, about one o'clock retired into the *ghusalkhana* or bathing-chamber, into which the great officers of the State were only admitted. There, affairs of inferior concern, such as the disposal of offices, were transacted. At half-past-two o'clock he retired into the harem to dine. He spent about an hour at table, and then, in the hot season, slumbered on a sofa for half-an-hour. He generally appeared at four in the balcony above the great gate of the palace. A mob of all kinds of people assembled there before him, some to claim his bounty, others to prefer complaints against the officers of the crown. He retired at six into the chapel for prayers, and, in half-an-hour he entered the *ghusalkhana*, into which at that hour the members of the cabinet were only admitted. He there took their advice upon all the important and secret affairs of government; and from thence orders were issued to various departments of the State. He was often detained till it was very late in this council, as conversation was mixed with business; but about nine he generally retired into the harem."

"I quote below a few lines from Pringle Kennedy,

the author of *The History of the Great Moghal*.

"Aurangzeb was a great man, much greater in intellect and also in moral force than either his father or grandfather. In his personal life he was abstemious, save as regards women, to an extreme degree, and even as regards the pleasures of the harem he was extremely moderate. He was a hard worker, even the Second Philip of Spain was not a more laborious toiler. To this ruler, indeed, he bore a considerable likeness; but in his intellect he was far keener, in his statesmanship saner, and in his religious bigotry more intelligent, than the monarch who threw back Spain for ever from the great nations of the earth. He had indeed a very different situation to deal with from that which confronted the Spanish monarch. Philip had to deal with two great sets of opponents, those which struggled against his desire for politic absolutism and the Protestant reformers. The latter at the start were but a small body, and as to the former, though many in number, most would have been content with a small amount of concession. It was his steady refusal to yield in the slightest to either that caused the revolts in the low countries and the endless wars there, which ruined Spain. Aurangzeb had, on the other hand, no members of a new creed, few in numbers and strong only in zeal, with which to contend; but he had to deal with a large majority of his subjects, the followers of an old religion, one which exerts the greatest power over its followers, and which enters into every act of their daily life. A

direct attack was accordingly impossible. It was only by gradual sop and mine that progress could be made. Throwing down the temples in the cities, such as Benares and Mathra, and building mosques in their places, the granting of high honours to converts, the gradual substitution of Muhammadans for Hindus, wherever practicable in high commands, the putting down of customs dear to Hinduism as repugnant to Muhammadanism, all these were measures by which this Muhammadan missionary desired to convert the people of Hindustan into a Muhammadan community. Add that he also looked on Rajputs with a jealous eye as having more political independence than he desired, and we can easily understand why the Hindus did not love Aurangzeb. But with all this it is doubtful whether he would not have been far more successful than he was, and whether he would not have handed down the imperial edifice practically unimpaired, had not there arisen at the time a Hindu of as iron a resolution and of as intrepid a genius as his own."

"Of all the sovereigns of the House of Timur—nay, of all the sovereigns of Delhi—no one since Sikandar Lodi, has never been apparently so distinguished for devotion, austerity and justice. In courage, long-sufferings, and sound judgment, he was unrivalled. But from reverence for injunctions of the law he did not make use of punishment, and without punishment the administration of a country cannot be maintained. Dissensions had arisen among his nobles through

rivalry. So every plan and project that he formed came to little good; and every enterprise which he undertook was long in execution, and failed of its objects. Although he lived for ninety years his five senses were not at all impaired, except his hearing, and that to only so slight an extent, that it was not perceptible to others, and he denied himself many pleasure naturally belonging to humanity."

"My readers will note with surprise that Aurangzeb was slow to punish, but the history of his whole reign shows that save in cases where he feared for his throne, particularly from his relations, he was exceedingly lenient. Pyramids of skulls had no fascination for him. We read nowhere in his reign of massacres, nor of cruelty such as is to be found in the annals of the earlier Mughals."*

I have quoted above some remarks of English historians of note, on Aurangzeb's private and public conduct and his personal character, to show my readers the force of truth and historical evidence that compelled the critics of Aurangzeb, prejudiced against him, to own to so many good qualities in him,—very rarely found in any one person. Why I call these historians *prejudiced* will be shown a little further on; but to place the character of Aurangzeb in its true light, and make it stand out clearer, showing his superiority to

*Some of these passages are cited from severe critics of Aurangzeb's history.

sovereigns to whom he bore some analogy, I quote a few remarks on the character and reign of Louis XIV., who is generally admitted to have been one of the greatest kings of Europe. The contrast will make each party appear in stronger light. I have selected Louis for this purpose because of all the kings of medieval Europe he bore the greatest resemblance to Aurangzeb.

"In Louis' character many elements of greatness can be found. His firm belief in himself, his sense of duty which led him to bear the trade of Kingship on his shoulders for some fifty-four years, the patience with which he carried out his aim of making France the leading power of Europe, all go to prove that Louis was far from being a mere commonplace man whose ideas were shallow and whose acts were showy and pretentious. He worked regularly and conscientiously all his life. He had a very elevated conception of the responsibilities of the kingly office. No amusement, and not even illness, prevented him from performing his regular duties. 'We are not private persons,' he once said, 'we owe ourselves to the public. In his private life he was, during most of his reign, considerate, thoughtful of others, courteous to women. He had all those qualities which go to make a gentleman. A great king he was, and western civilisation owes much to his reign."

'The young king yielding to his clerical advisers abandoned once and for all the liberal minded policy of Henry IV, and inaugurated the era of persecution. In

April 1661, Louis agreed to the demand of the clergy that commissioners should be sent into the provinces, to report on the Protestant churches built since the *Edict of Nanets*; for the clergy claimed that article 9 of that edict only allowed the Protestants to exercise their worship in certain places, and therefore that all churches built since 1597 should be pulled down. The result of the commission was favourable to these views and numerous churches were demolished. Not only was public worship gradually proscribed but many vexatious restraints were imposed on the Protestants. The signal had been given and preparatory measures were taken which made quite apparent to foresighted men the nature and meaning of the king's policy. In 1666 the first emigrations took place, and in 1668 it was reported that 800 French Protestant families had arrived at The Hague. The Elector of Brandenburg ventured to protest against the infractions of the *Edict of Nantes*; but Louis replied that no churches which were in existence in 1597 had been destroyed. A system of semi-persecution was thus continued in accordance with the strict Jesuit interpretation of the *Treaty of Nantes*. Already burials in the day-time were prohibited on the ground that no clause could be found permitting interments by day. In 1670, school masters were forbidden to teach any subject save reading, writing and arithmetic, on the ground that the Edict contained no list of subjects which the Protestants might teach. On such frivolous interpretations of the Edict many schools

were closed and only one master was allowed in each school. These regulations were severely enforced through the instrumentality of the clergy, and the Protestant schools were practically ruined."

"In 1669 the violent persecution shown by the Bishop of Amiens resulted in a large emigration of the Protestants of Picardy to England. In 1675 the clergy demanded that Protestant children should be converted at the age of fourteen, and in 1681 a royal edict declared that such children could be converted at the age of seven. The Protestants had to choose between ignorance or conversion. They were thus treated like Turks or infidels. They were, like loyal French subjects, ready and willing to fight for their country; they were the backbone of the commercial prosperity of France. But Louis had always dreaded as well as disliked them. In 1668 he feared a revolt of the French Huguenots, and in 1680 he ordered that the Protestant officers should gradually be dismissed from the navy. The king had evidently been entirely misinformed as to the strength of dissidents, for as a political party Huguenots do not seem to have been well organised, or in any way dangerous. But after the *Peace of Nimeguen* a change had come over Louis' Life. He fell under the influence of Pere la Chaise and Madame de Maintenon. Colbert's influence was waning, that of Louvain's was increasing. The lying reports of intendants notifying the conversion of thousands rendered Colbert's advice fruitless, and Louis' fresh persecuting measures—the result of his

religious and political ardour—were accompanied by a rapid series of emigrations. In 1681 a large number of Protestants fled from the west and the north, and in 1683, after Colbert's death, persecution and the destruction of churches continued with renewed vigour till the culminating point was reached in the Dragonnade of 1685 and the revocation itself."

"In 1688 the largest emigration took place, and apart from the thousands of good citizens who left the country, we must notice the remarks of Vauban, that France lost 600 officers and 12,000 soldiers better seasoned than their Catholic brethren. And this took place in 1688, the year of all others when Louis required all his best soldiers to combat the rising flood of European hostility."

"Above 300,000 emigrants left the country including the best men of France as regards birth, substance and reputation. The trade of the country went with them, and the rest of Louis' reign is a period of economic decadence.....The year 1684 saw Louis at the height of his power, the year 1685 saw the commission of this fatal error and the beginning of the decline of the greatness and influence of France."

"The French soldiers devastated the Palatinate, the town of Heidelberg was burnt, and its magnificent castle was ruined. The whole country was ravaged; cities and agriculture destroyed; the Rhine district left in great part a desert. This second devastation of the Palatinate well marks the end of Louis' culminating

period of prosperity, which beginning with the *Peace of Nimeguen*, closes with a deed unsurpassed in cruelty and lawlessness."

"In 1684 the weight of taxes led to riots in the provinces which reappeared from time to time throughout Le Peltier's ministry. The many exemptions from taxation rendered the lot of the *roturier* (plebian) particularly hard, and aroused a bitter feeling towards the rich, who not unfrequently paid little or nothing. Moreover the collection of the taxes was often accompanied by corruption, fraud and violence, and many unfortunate men were thrown into horrible prisons from which they rarely emerged alive. But the year 1685 was destined to bring more troubles upon the French nation. As if existing exactions and the inequalities of taxation were not sufficient evils, the revocation of the *Edict of Nantes* added fresh difficulties'

"In May 1688 Le Peltier wrote to the intendant of the *Generahte of Bordeaux*. The king desires you to examine the design which he has in his mind of expelling the Jews from the kingdom. But this step should only be taken after much consideration, lest the interest of commerce, which has already been damaged by the exodus of the Huguenots, should fall into utter ruin'

"From the year 1692 the starving population became dangerous. Desperate men demanding bread infested the country and threatened all who had property or who were known to have money. The forests became the hiding places of bands of armed and ferocious

peasants who issued out only to rob and to kill."

"It is of little avail to attempt to justify the cancelling of solemn engagements, or to endeavour to explain away obvious facts. But there is still less reason for ascribing to Louis any peculiar malignity in thus disregarding his previous engagements. He simply acted in strict accordance with the political morality of the age. Treaties were in both the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries viewed with remarkable indifference, and many instances might be cited to show that France had not the monopoly of bad faith at that period. Nay, more, it may be urged that Louis' action was beneficial to Spain and Europe generally."

"The *Congress of Utrecht* was opened on January the 12th, 1712, but before many weeks were over both Bourbon Courts had been thrown into inexorable grief and consternation at the successive deaths of the Duchess and Duke of Burgundy, followed by that of their eldest child, the Duke of Brittany. In both Paris and Madrid it was believed that the Duke of Orleans was sweeping away the royal family in order to secure the throne for himself, and it was asserted that neither the life of Louis XIV or Philip V was safe." (From *Hassall's History of Louis XIV*).

Religious persecution, unreasonable and very heavy taxation, assassinations and political murders, and very long and bloody civil wars and wars of succession, in Aurangzeb's time and thereabouts, were much more horrible in Europe than in Hindustan. One can adduce

innumerable instances of this kind from the histories of medieval Europe. I do not mean to say that the common occurrence of evil in Europe in those days justifies Aurangzeb in committing evil, but I contend that, on comparing the histories of those days, one comes to the unmistakable conclusion that Aurangzeb and his politics were infinitely superior to European sovereigns and their politics. But Europe has since then been making very long and rapid strides towards civilisation, while Asia has been degenerating and retrograding in the same proportion until quite recently and then with the help and example of the European Powers. Alamgir's (Aurangzeb's) reign was the culmination of the Mughal Empire in India, whose decline and downfall would have certainly taken place fifty years earlier if Aurangzeb had not appeared on the stage, not only to save the empire from disintegration and total ruin, but to further expand and strengthen it, and to steer its ship—whose immediate wreck was threatened by the violent storm of rivalry—safely through fifty-five years, including five of his son's reign, with unparalleled skill.

All States are always exposed to external and internal dangers. To guard against external danger they always maintain armies and navies at the expense of the people. But to guard against internal danger is a most difficult and sometimes an impossible task. There are only three ties that hold states together—community of religion, community of race, and

community of interest. States are always exposed to internal dangers in proportion to their lacking one, two or all communities numerated above. The Muslim Empire in India has always lacked in all the above-named ties. Their maintenance for a long time was absolutely impossible. There is only one means of maintaining them in apparently united form, that is force. If a government has got its own force sufficiently strong to coerce the jarring elements of the State into some degree of union and harmony, it can maintain it as long as the external coercive force balances the internal centrifugal forces. But as soon as the equilibrium is disturbed the government comes to an end. This is the reason why European powers are more tenacious in maintaining their hold upon foreign conquests than Asiatic nations. Their government plant strikes deeply in its native soil, derives its life-juice through its root-fibres from its native soil and congenial elements. Its strength and stability depend wholly upon its roots in its native land. Its ramifications and foliage continue to spread in all favourable directions. The greater the surface of the foliage exposed to the atmosphere, the greater is the amount of carbonic acid obtained from the atmosphere for its nourishment. In this way the European powers spread themselves, being supported by their roots in the native land and obtaining nourishment from all around, often sufficient to nourish the roots and the trunk also. When their branches, growing continually, become too long to be

supported by the native root and trunk, they throw down aerial roots, like those of the banyan tree, which strike into the soil to afford new support to the growing branch to enable it to spread farther safely. The European powers, in the same way expanding to distant foreign possessions or dependencies, continue establishing out-stations, like aerial roots, to support the distal portions of their ever-growing and lengthening branches.

The Asiatic powers, that formerly obtained foreign possessions, severed themselves from their native land and were thus transplanted into uncongenial soil. Such were the Mughals in India, the Turks in Eastern Europe, and the Moors in Spain. They were like exotic plants transferred to a foreign climate. As long as their native vitality inherent in their organs remained whole, they continued to grow and prosper; but as the inimical effects of the unwholesome environment continued to weaken this native vitality, it was naturally doomed to destruction sooner or later. When the Mughals conquered India they severed themselves from their mother-country and planted themselves in a foreign land. According to the unchangeable natural laws their empire was destined to disappear soon. If they had continued to recruit their soldiers from the north-western countries of Afghanistan, Tartary, Persia and Mongolia, they might have maintained their domination in India much longer. But having no trunk-root firmly struck in its native soil, mere occasional recruiting from their native land could not be of much avail.

counter to their preconceptions are rejected as wholly unreliable. This is the reason why authors of similar talents, acquirements, and commanding similar sources of information differ in their descriptions of the lives of the same persons.

In judging of the characters of others the writers are solely guided by their own characters. Everybody knows his own state of mind, while nobody has the means of knowing the mental states of others with any amount of probability, to say nothing of certainty. When, biographers wish to find out the motive of a person for a particular action they place themselves, in imagination, in the position of the person in question and then think what kind of motive would stimulate them to such an action, and thus by examining their own minds they guess what passes in the minds of others.

This is the method generally followed by European biographers and historians in the investigation of their subjects, so one can easily understand how far they are to be relied upon.

The above quotations from Aurangzeb's critics are striking illustrations of this pernicious propensity.

Mr. Lane-Pool asserts in his *Aurangzeb*, page 60, that all contemporary Christians denounce Aurangzeb as a hypocrite who used religion as a cloak for ambition, and said prayers to cover the most unnatural murders.

Flying in the face of the overwhelming testimony of

all reliable histories that Aurangzeb never committed a single deed of cruelty in his long reign of fifty years (which Mr. Lane-Poole himself admits) is outrageous. Religious rancour and national conceit are at the root of such allegations, but the proximate cause is the general propensity of these writers, as already explained. They themselves, being of materialistic turn of mind, cannot realise the force of religious sentiment which overrules all other feelings, passions and interests of human nature when once it takes possession of a sincere, true, veracious and devout mind. In Aurangzeb's position they could not realise any other motive for religious observance than making it a cloak for ambition. In calumniating Aurangzeb they have portrayed their own minds so truly and in such big, clear characters that all who run may read.

Alexander Dow's imputation, that while Aurangzeb raised one hand in prayer, he signed with the other warrants for murders and assassinations, is not less atrocious. Being prejudiced against Aurangzeb, he either invented it himself, or taking it from some other inventor accepted it and passed it on for fact.

Mr. Lane-Poole himself, I am sorry to say, is not perfectly free from prejudice, though he is more indulgent and better informed than Aurangzeb's other critics.

"Generosity was not a salient virtue in the character of Aurangzeb, who was reputed to be avaricious and niggardly in matters of money and presents." (Lane-Poole's Aurangzeb, page 81).

The whole history of his reign proves that Aurangzeb was not only unsurpassed in generosity and magnanimity, but unparalleled in this respect. In the teeth of such unquestionable facts Mr. Lane-Poole's detracting of Aurangzeb's character can never hold water. He spent greater sums of money in the true interests of public good than any other Muslim sovereign of India. A single act of stinginess can never be proved against him. But I know the sources upon which Mr. Lane-Poole has drawn for his valuable and generally unknown information that Aurangzeb was reputed to be avaricious.

India, being among the richest countries of the world, supplies its population not only with all the necessities of life but with abundance of luxuries, and in Aurangzeb's time with a greater amount of wealth than the people knew how to spend. The rich classes, consequently, became indolent, luxurious and self-indulgent. They spent their superfluous wealth in pursuit of sensual pleasures, fame and reputation. A dancing-girl with her graceful movements, a singer with his or her sweet melody, a bard or poet with his eulogic poems composed to flatter some rich person, pleased and enchanted, and obtained immense rewards in return. Sometimes rent-free estates were bestowed upon such articles for gratifying the sensual pleasures of the rich.

I once heard of a noble, or highly placed official of the Mughal Court, named Munim Khan, with the title

of Khan Khanan, who once started from Delhi on his travels to the Deccan. At the end of the first stage, while sitting at dinner, he heard a mendicant singing the following couplet of Shaikh Sadi :

*"Munim be Koho-dasht-o-bayaban Gharib nest ;
Har ja ke raft khemazado bargah sakht."*

The opulent is not a stranger in the mountains, plains and deserts ;

Wherever he goes tents are pitched and a palace built for him.

The name of the noble was Munim which means opulent or wealthy, and he was travelling in great state with a considerable retinue, and followers carrying tents, specie and luxuries. The mendicant's singing a couplet so appropriate to the occasion was striking, and so delighted the noble that he ordered a lac of rupees to be given him, and immediately, to the beggar's great surprise and joy, bags of money with camels to carry them were bestowed upon him. He continued to follow the camps and when the noble was dining at the second stage the beggar repeated the same couplet, on which another lac of rupees was given him, and the money was counted out to the mendicant as on the previous day. For nine successive days the beggar followed the camp, singing the same song at the usual hour and receiving the same amount of money. Then some of the noble's ahlkars, considering this prodigality a useless waste of money, warned the beggar that his cumulated riches exposed him to rapine.

and murder, on which he left the camp and led his treasure-laden camels home. At the tenth stage of the journey, when the noble sat at dinner, he expected to hear the mendicant's cry as usual, but being disappointed he asked his attendants why the *beggar* had not turned up that day. They replied that thinking himself rich enough to pass the rest of his days in independence and ease, he might have turned back. On this the noble exclaimed "Unfortunate wretch ! I would have given him the same amount daily if he had followed us to the end of our journey,"

This is one of many stories of great generosity current among the natives. They misname such prodigality generosity and liberality. Such extravagance generally ends in ruining both the giver and the receiver.

Aurangzeb stopped such useless waste of money soon after his accession to the throne. At the same time he banished all the nautch-girls, musicians and buffoons from his court as unworthy of the court of a Muslim king. So the poets, bards, musicians, dancing-girls and buffoons had to leave the capital to earn their livelihood and sought employment at the courts of Rajas and with nobles.

Though converts from among these people received very liberal allowances and *pensions* from the emperor, few of them cared to give up their long cherished and hereditary occupations. The unconverted majority, wherever they went, spread the false news that Aurang-

zeb was stingy and greedy of wealth.

Either directly or indirectly through Manucci, Bernier, etc., these rumours are the sources from which Mr. Lane-Poole obtained the information that Aurangzeb was reputed to be avaricious.

It is quite a common-sense principle that information from such sources never ought to be taken for facts, unless confirmed by reliable informants.

Great people, and particularly rulers and reformers can never be universally popular. Persons disappointed by them in their expectations have cause to complain against them. People, dissenting from them in religious or political views, usually exert themselves to destroy their popularity by any means at their disposal,—false accusations, unjust censure, vile calumnies, distorted facts and misrepresentations. The adherents and followers of rival parties also entertain hostile feelings towards them, and give vent to them whenever a suitable opportunity presents itself.

Poets, long used to acquire enormous rewards for composing flattering and panegyrical poems and reading them to great persons, were deprived by Aurangzeb of their exorbitant and, to him, unlawful gains. What attitude would one expect such men to assume towards Aurangzeb? Similarly Shuja's and Murad's adherents could not love Aurangzeb. The nautch-girls, musicians, and buffoons already alluded to must be placed in the same category. For these reasons one cannot be overcautious in rejecting such false and misleading

statements and tradition.

To return to the influence exerted by mentality on judgments and actions, I mention here a common-place incident that occurred to me; and similar incidents occur at times to everybody in the ordinary walks of life.

A gentleman who had recently taken to homeopathy said to me a few months ago, "How can anybody rely on homeopathic dilutions purchased from homeopathic pharmacies? No chemical or physical test can detect the presence and amount of drugs in the *high and medium dilutions*. One dilution can be sold for all dilutions with impunity." I replied "The Pharmacist calculates the amount of profit necessary to his business and in accordance therewith fixes his rates. He can therefore have no motive for deceiving his customers."

He, not being satisfied with my reply, said that being saved the labour of preparing all dilutions separately according to the elaborate process of Hahnemann, they make maximum profits with minimum trouble, and are confident that their fraud can never be detected. I said "When one can earn an honest livelihood without having recourse to base and felonious means, I cannot understand why one should deviate from an upright course of business." The matter to both of us seemed very simple, yet neither of us was convinced by the arguments of the other, and so we clung to our own opinions each not grasping the mentality of the

other. My friend seemed to be under the impression that all man's actions are guided aright by fear and external force only. I do not believe in the generality of this view. I believe that, generally speaking, men need neither fear nor force to oblige them to keep in the right path ; but that high innate ideas guide them at all times under every condition and in every place, and keep them in the path of rectitude.

Aurangzeb's ideal of kingship was quite different from that of the generality of kings. Kings use their power and wealth in satisfying their desires and gratifying their passions as well as in governing their countries.

Aurangzeb's kingship on the contrary was too heavy for feeble human nature. It afforded him no pleasure save what resulted from the happiness of his subjects, but was a constant source of trouble, care, anxiety and distress. Born to a king he considered himself destined to rule, so he was morally bound to perform all the duties of a king whether he liked to do so or not. He was extremely jealous of his kingship and never brooked even the idea of a rival. It was his firm belief that no greater disaster could befall a nation than civil war excited by rival claimants to the throne, and that it was the first and most important duty of a king to prevent such wars.

His knowledge of the history of India previous to his time and his own personal experience confirmed him in this belief. His sense of duty towards his

people, coupled with moral courage, practical wisdom, circumspection, penetration, and an iron will—his characteristics—made him sacrifice his eldest brother and son, defeat his second brother, and imprison the youngest. He continued to sacrifice his own health, comfort and enjoyments to secure the peace, order, liberty and progress of his people.

The facts of his life are on record and before the eyes of all his critics and historians. If his doings and sayings were true reflections of his thoughts and feelings then he was certainly a most sincere, pious, virtuous, wise and just king. If, on the contrary, he was so ambitious of power that he sacrificed all his pleasures, comforts, and health, and some of his dear and near relatives, and made a show of extreme virtue and piety simply for the sake of acquiring that power, then he was certainly the worst hypocrite and imposter the world ever saw.

The opinion that Aurangzeb practised virtue and religious rites simply to palliate his crimes and veil his ambition has been exploded by Mr. Lane-Poole's matter-of-fact and most convincing observations, to which I beg my readers to refer if they feel disposed to verify my remark.

Now there are only two ways of judging of Aurangzeb's character,—from his sayings and doings, or from his thoughts and motives.

His sayings and doings are open for everyone's study. His thoughts and motives are either guessed at from

uncertain and ambiguous data or inferred from premises founded on facts.

If the former course be adopted then all his sunshine and not the slightest shade or blemish is perceptible in Aurangzeb's character. There are only a few of his acts which can be interpreted in different ways. If we do not pretend to possess the gift of divination, then we ought to accept the interpretation given by the doer of these actions, and that of reliable historians. If this method be employed there remains no doubt of those few actions being meritorious.

The sacrifice of two of his sons by Brutus is considered meritorious, a sort of golden deed, an act of fortitude and self-abnegation because he suppressed his own parental feelings for, what seemed to him, the good of the state, and I do not understand why Aurangzeb's acts are considered heinous when for similar reasons he meted out similar treatment to his relatives.

One can say in reply that Brutus was a good man, and his actions were prompted by good motives. This is true; but if he was good then Aurangzeb was better, and nothing but prejudice can guess his motives to be bad.

If the other or second course be adopted for judging his character then some facts in his life ought to be produced which are open to no other interpretation than that they were the offspring of bad motives. As this has never been done and can never be done then ascribing his actions to bad motives is mere guess-

work, unworthy of serious literature.

A few days ago a friend of mine, speaking of Dara's sentence of death, said that the judges, knowing Aurangzeb's mind, passed the sentence of capital punishment to please the emperor (Aurangzeb) and to win his favour.

This remark seems very probable, plausible and shrewd. Kings, princes, and other great and influential people generally command and control the thoughts and actions of their dependents and attendants. But when the circumstances and particulars of Dara's case are known the remark does not seem very appropriate. The punishment of apostates by death was a generally accepted law of Islam. In all the books on law, written before Aurangzeb's time, this punishment for apostates is recorded. Aurangzeb's whole-souled devotion throughout his life to Islamic rules whose scrupulous execution sometimes cost him enormously, is a fact beyond all doubt. Spiritual leaders, doctors and judges are always more intolerant of heresy and religious error than their lay brethren, and consequently more fanatic and severe in inflicting punishment.

Dara was not an ordinary apostate; his position and influence enhanced the gravity of the offence of apostasy and made him a devil incarnate in the eyes of the Muslims of that age. They saw that he was inclined to introduce idolatry among them, and with the prospect of his becoming in the near future the supreme power in India—where idolatrous sects infi

nitely out-numbered the worshippers of the one, true God—the outlook must have indeed seemed to them very dark, dismal and sinister; and though we cannot fully, we can in part realise the horror with which they regarded him.

In these circumstances the remark that the Muslim judges' verdict was given agreeably to Aurangzeb's wishes is inappropriate as the judges, for the reasons just given, required no such prompting.

During the course of my study of Aurangzeb's history I thought I had made a discovery which, if published, would vindicate a much maligned, honest and innocent man, who has long been made a target of for the malicious, unjust, unfounded and wanton shafts of accusation. But, in prosecuting my study further, I made another discovery which seems to me of more importance than the former.

This second discovery is a new method of reading the actual mental biographies of authors. Events, which occurred in the physical world, can be learnt from many sources, such as history, tradition and the traces left, which last may be either perceptible to the eye or the other senses. But the mental states of any person can only be inferred from the ideas embodied in his spoken and written words, and particularly from the judgments he passed upon others' characters.

By reading *Storia*, *Bernier's Travels*, and *Dow's History of India*, one learns more of their authors' characters than of those which they tried to paint.

If a class of writers would undertake to read authors' characters from their works and publish their findings, a new kind of literature would come into existence. This literature would have a two-fold effect,—it would form interesting reading, and be a wholesome check on the wanton liberties of future authors who, from fear of betraying their own hidden defects, would think twice before pronouncing judgment on, or writing a word about, others.

I now proceed to criticise some quotations from the European historians of Aurangzeb, and expose the weakness of the charges contained in them.

Manucci, Bernier and Tavernier have really sown the tares of falsehood in the field of wheat of Indian history. Their pernicious writings continue spreading infection by being cited in the otherwise sane writings of eminent historians of modern times. Now, Europeans, having been for more than a hundred years in closer connection with the natives of India, must realise that the harems of wealthy Muhammadans are kept strictly secreted from the gaze of all men except very near relations. In Manucci's time a foreigner living a hundred years in India could know nothing of the harems. But this pseudo-historian's work is full of stories of harem life. The greater part of such rubbish is certainly false and malicious invention.

Bernier's and Tavernier's works are full of hearsay and their own embellishments.

In spite of the admission of modern writers of the

unreliability of European travellers' stories, as has been already shown, they continue to follow and quote them as their authorities. This sort of inconsistency is quite unpardonable. I am totally unwilling to doubt the veracity of the English historians, yet why this inconsistency? If the stories are unreliable then quotations from them cannot be accepted as true. "And the habit of intoxication," says S. L. Poole, "had become so universal among the nobles and officials that even the Chief Kazi used to smuggle his daily dram into his house of a morning" (Lane-Poole's *Aurangzeb* p. 18). The same author denounces Manucci's work as 'too full of errors,' and yet he follows him in his most absurd stories. The Kazi's drinking was simply invented by Manucci, and other Europeans have followed him, but none of the native historians of India ever wrote such humbug.

"And when Sulaiman Shukoh entreated that, rather than have his strength and reason undermined by drugs (as was thought to be often the fate of captive princes) he might be put to death at once, the emperor addressed him in the mildest accents, and assured him of safety and good treatment. It was not believed that he kept his word for Sulaiman, his brother Sipahr Shukoh and the young son of Murad all died in Gwalior within a short space." (Elphinstone's *History of India*). This whole statement is untrue; and Bernier knew nothing about these occurrences, his sources of information being hearsay and his own imagination.

He thought that the princes would be given poppy-head infusion to drink and they would die in consequence sooner or later, so he thought himself justified in recording their deaths before they occurred.

Sulaiman's representations to the emperor about the drug, and the emperor's promise to exempt him from its use, its subsequent use, and the death of the three princes from the drug, are all based on Bernier's legend. There is no evidence of this fact in any historical work written by Indians.

"Two daughters of Aurangzeb were given in marriage to the prisoners: one was allotted to the younger son of Dara, and a similar consolation was awarded to the son of Murad Bakhsh. It seemed that old sores did not rankle with these complaisant bridegrooms." (S. L. Poole's *Aurangzeb*, P. 59). These are the bridegrooms of Aurangzeb's daughters who, Bernier says, died in Gwalior prison from the effects of *post* (poppyhead infusion), and Governor Elphinstone believes him implicitly.

The story of the two princes' deaths recorded by Bernier is analogous to an occurrence I experienced myself. A long time ago, I was inspecting vaccinated children in a village. I took the chaukidar's birth and death registers and compared them with the number vaccinated. My eye caught the name of the lambardar of that village in the death-register, while there he was helping me in collecting the children. I asked the chaukidar why he reported his death. The artless

man replied that he had seen the lambardar eight days previously lying at death's door. That day was his reporting day, so he went to the thana and reported the man's death which seemed then very near. He did not think that the lambardar would give the slip even to the angel of death.

"For religion's sake he waged his unending wars in the Deccan, not so much to stretch wider the boundaries of his great empire as to bring the lands of the heretical *Shias* within the dominion of orthodox Islam." (S. L. Poole's *Aurangzeb* p. 65).

It was not Aurangzeb alone among the sovereigns of India who waged war in the Daccan. Allauddin Khilji conquered it 400 years before; Muhammad Taghlaq conquered and governed it for a long time; Akbar fought and annexed Ahmadnagar and Khandesh; Jahangir continued fighting there, while Shahjahan extended his empire still more in that direction. Aurangzeb did nothing new, he did what his predecessors had been doing and aiming at. Through the great failures of his predecessors in attempting its conquest, the Deccan kings had grown bolder by Aurangzeb's time, and helped the Mahratta robbers to make raids into the Mughal dominions. Aurangzeb was then forced to conquer and annex that part of the country. He, being more fortunate than his predecessors, succeeded in conquering the whole country in a comparatively short time. In none of the Persian histories of India is the heresy of the Deccan kings assigned as

Aurangzeb's motive for suppressing them. When hostilities break out between individuals, communities or nations, each party speaks of the other's defects and vices, and gives it bad names and epithets. In this way some *Sunni* authors called the *Shi'as* heretics, and they called the *Sunnis* *Kharjis*, but it does not prove that the difference of persuasion was the cause of their suppression. In the whole history of Islam a war has never been waged simply on the ground of the two parties belonging to different sects of Islam. Aurangzeb being an orthodox and sincere Muslim could not invent novel doctrines.

'The Deccan would never have troubled Hindustan if Hindustan had not invaded it (*Id* p 69)

This is a still more monstrous assertion. In the history of the world one cannot find a single instance of two neighbouring powers always maintaining friendly relations with each other, without some external power holding them together forcibly. England and Scotland were never at peace until both were united under one power. Even the most civilised European powers of to-day, in spite of their keeping a 'balance of power' and a hundred other contrivances to maintain peace, cannot prevent wars breaking out from time to time between neighbouring States. If it be taken for granted that the Deccan would not have troubled Hindustan if it had been let alone, then Akbar was responsible for the subsequent misfortune as he initiated the wars, and Aurangzeb found himself handicapped.

when he came to the throne, so he is not blamable for his predecessors' mistakes.

"Aurangzeb might indeed have renounced the dream of power, and reverted to the ascetic ideal of his youth : but Dara and Shuja were infidels or heretics whom it was his duty, as a true Muslim, to drive from the throne." (*S. L. Poole, p. 63*).

Dara was certainly an infidel, and Aurangzeb always thought of suppressing him, but it is equally certain that Aurangzeb always tried to maintain friendly relations with Shuja. He got Shuja's daughter betrothed to his own son, Sultan, to strengthen friendly ties between them. Before the outbreak of war with Dara he wrote very friendly letters to Shuja ; on reaching Agra, after Samugarh, he tried and succeeded in getting from his father, the emperor, some Behar districts added to Shuja's dominions. He was desirous and tried in vain for a long time to get them. When Aurangzeb was in Multan pursuing Dara, he heard from the eastern news-writers that Shuja had prepared, and actually started, to invade Agra. He was surprised to hear that and did not believe it till more news from different persons confirmed the fact. He thought himself Shuja's benefactor and did not believe that he would forget his services. All the reliable Persian histories attest this fact. In the face of such strong evidence it is very unreasonable to talk of Aurangzeb's hostility to Shuja as due to his heresy. Mir Jumla was one of the most loyal friends and generals of Aurangzeb.

his son¹¹ held first rank in the State, and both were Shias.

"The shrewdest of all contemporary European witnesses, the French doctor, Bernier, who was a spectator of the horrors of the fratricidal war, a sympathiser with Dara, and no lenient critic of Aurangzeb, at whose court he spent eight observant years, sums up the whole matter with his usual fairness." (S. L. Poole's *Aurangzeb*, p. 63).

Bernier may be shrewd but he was not a spectator of the horrors of the fratricidal war. He reached Delhi after Aurangzeb's triumph in four decisive battles over his brothers and the capture of Murad Bakhsh, towards the end of 1659, and passed about five-and-a-half years with his patron Danishmand Khan, a noble in Aurangzeb's court, and then left Delhi, going back for good before the middle of 1665. He succeeded in securing some allowance either from Danishmand's purse or through his intercession from the State Charity Fund. I find his name nowhere among Aurangzeb's courtiers, neither does he ever speak of his being presented to the emperor or talking to him, while, in a few places in his book he has mentioned his *agha's* (Danishmand Khan's) talking to him, or *hearing* from him of some affairs. During Aurangzeb's long and serious illness Bernier was at Delhi, but neither native court-chroniclers nor Bernier himself speak of his being ever able to see the emperor in those days.

Mr. S. Lane-Poole is a very moderate and indulgent

critic of Aurangzeb. His accusations are of a less serious nature than those of others. I now quote a few objections from P. Kennedy's *History of Great Mughals*.

"His method of gaining the throne was indeed crooked to the extreme, and pleas of religion were in this case indeed but an excuse for worldly gain. His objections to his brothers as irreligious, however sincere, were not the motive force in his conduct, and ruling motive in the wars conquering the throne, was without a doubt self-aggrandisement. After he had obtained the throne too and ruled in peace and safety, as far as an eastern sovereign ever can or could, he still preferred the crooked rather than the straight course ; was full of trickery and deceit and did not hesitate, where he thought it desirable, to poison or get rid of any person who he thought was plotting against him."

This wholasale condemnation of Aurangzeb's conduct contradicts every fact related of him in authentic histories. When a historian finds out some new historical fact, it is his duty as a historian to mention the source, date, authority or evidence proving its truth. When the newly discovered fact contradicts all the previous knowledge about it, then the discoverer is doubly bound to prove and demonstrate its truth ; but Mr. P. Kennedy has not proved his assertion by any reliable evidence whatever. He has clearly, in this instance, followed Bernier and Manucci whose untrustworthiness he has affirmed himself, as quoted further back. If an unreliable person reports an event which

is corroborated by trustworthy evidence from other sources, it may be safely admitted as true; but when it runs counter to authenticated reports and commonly received opinions it ought to be rejected unless proved from other sources.

The following are some remarks on the dark side of Aurangzeb's character by A. Dow in his *History of India*.

"Dark and determined in his policy, he broke through every restraint to accomplish his design. He pointed in a direct line to the goal of ambition, and he cared not by what means he removed whatever object obstructed his way. He either believed that morality was inconsistent with the great trust of government; or, he acted as if he believed it; and he sometimes descended to a vicious meanness, which threw discredit upon his abilities, as well as upon his honesty. He held the cloak of religion between his actions and the vulgar; and impiously thanked the Divinity for a success which he owed to his own wickedness. When he was murdering and persecuting his brothers and their families, he was building a magnificent mosque at Delhi, as an offering to God for His assistance to him in the civil wars. He acted as high-priest at the consecration of this temple; and made a practice of attending divine service there, in the humble dress of a *fakir*. But when he lifted one hand to the Divinity, he, with the other, signed warrants for the assassination of his relations." (*History of India* by A. Dow,

Vol. III. p. 334).

This author has presented here the worst picture of Aurangzeb that his imagination could paint. There is not a single fact mentioned in any authentic history that gives support to any of the above assertions, barring of course the Story of Tom Thumb' and French inventions.

It is well known to all his historians, native or foreign, that Aurangzeb abhorred bloodshed, even in cases where it was lawful for political reasons or sanctioned by law. The execution of the apostate, Dara, in consequence of a judgment passed by a council of nobles and judges, and Sambhaji's execution in consequence of his ruining the country by plundering and butchering the people, are the only instances of executions by him in his fifty years' reign. Except in these two cases he never ordered an execution during his reign. He had appointed courts of justice and very able judges to carry on judicial work according to law, and they always inflicted punishments. He exercised very careful supervision over them, and in the case of capital punishments throughout the empire, the sentences had to be reported to him first, without whose consent they were not carried out. I do not cite here any of the native historians, who are unanimous in praise of Aurangzeb's virtue and justice but I offer Mr. S. L. Poole's reply to Bernier's objections, which shows the baselessness of the remarks made by Aurangzeb's other detractors also.

"All we know of his methods of government, however, goes to prove that his fine sentiments were really the ruling principles of his life. No act of injustice, according to the law of Islam, has been proved against him." (S. L. Poole's *Aurangzeb*, p. 80).

Now I hope to have made it clear that the slanderous remarks of the two books quoted above are based on the vile calumnies of *Storia* and *Bernier's Travels*. I have already shown Bernier's unscrupulous method in writing his book, when he reported the deaths of two princes by poisoning, while both were alive and died long after by natural deaths. There are many examples of such fabrication in his book. I offer here another very positive instance of the French travellers' fabrications. Monsieur Tavernier and Dr. Bernier, speaking of Aurangzeb's extreme austerity, both say "No animal food passed his lips."

This is totally untrue. Muhammadans never consider the use of meat unlawful or luxurious or abstaining from it a great virtue. Hindus generally consider its use unlawful. Both the French authors when writing on Aurangzeb's abstemious habits forgot that he was a Muhammadan, not a Hindu, and their thoughts became so confused that they gave him a character which did not belong to him at all. Besides this the Hindus abstain from meat to avoid cruelty to animals, and therefore they never allow shooting or hunting animals for food. Aurangzeb was very fond of shooting and hunting, and there was no more cruelty in eating

animal food than in killing animals. The Prophet, whom Aurangzeb strictly followed, never abstained from animal food. There is much other humbug in those books which wholly discredit all their statements unsupported by reliable evidence. It is a great pity that the virulent germs of falsehood have infected all modern writing on the subject which would otherwise be very healthy. It is the credulity of modern authors that has played the part of susceptibility of the physical frame to catch infection. Trickery, fraud, dissimulation, cruelty etc., imputed to Aurangzeb by Venetian malice and French invention have no historical basis at all.

On examining Aurangzeb's histories carefully, one is struck by his very extraordinary character. He grasped a situation with wonderful quickness; he found out the proper measures to meet emergencies with great quickness; and put them into action without a moment's hesitation. He seldom took thought for the morrow. Past impressions had no power to interfere in present necessary actions. The following notions of Longfellow were embodied in his person.

'Trust no future howe'er pleasant,
Let the dead past bury its dead;
Act, act in the living present,
Heart within and God o'er head.'

All his actions prove that he was a firm believer in the Lord's saying, "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

When Aurangzeb started from the Deccan to see his

father in Agra, to ascertain how he really was, he had no reason to believe that Dara would fight him during his father's life, but he was afraid that Shahjahan might be lying at death's door, therefore he had taken his army with him as a precautionary measure. He fought and won two battles before reaching Agra. On arriving at that city he found the situation very different from what he expected. He then, to meet this emergency, had to cut off all his father's communication with the outside world. He immediately put this plan into execution as the only means of saving himself. Hitherto he had been very friendly with Murad but in Agra Murad began to plot against him and had completed preparations to strike a fatal blow. Aurangzeb apprehended this new situation in time and acted so as to pull down Murad's edifice of hostility in a twinkling. If he had not acted in the particular way he adopted, his destruction was inevitable. When Shuja took it into his head to ruin Aurangzeb, then Aurangzeb had to overthrow him; but up to that time he never expected such a sudden change on Shuja's part. In this way, like an automatic machine, under the influence of the impulses produced by present circumstances, Aurangzeb acted throughout his whole life; yet, in spite of this rule of conduct, his actions were very wise and very successful. Men of the world, particularly Europeans, thought that such wise and efficient plans, so wonderfully adapted to the object aimed at, were not formed without long deliberation, artful

means, and secret designs. Whenever he succeeded in suppressing hostile emergencies quickly, they thought the plan was preconceived, maturing for a long time, and executed at a fit opportunity. But this is all guess-work; facts do not support such an opinion. His firm faith in the justice of his cause, and his trust in God, were his mainstay under every circumstance and condition.

When he was fighting with Dara, and his army was driven back, with scarcely thousand sawars remaining at his side, he ordered his elephant's legs to be chained that it might not turn back. This reckless act seems foolish, but his hope of success was still as firm as before. He always used to say that victory and defeat did not depend upon the strength of the army or human skill, but on God's will. When he was going to give battle to Shuja, Raja Jaswant Singh, playing traitor, deserted his camp with 14,000 Rajputs, and produced great disorder in the army, dispersing about 40,000 more men. When Aurangzeb was informed of the fact he did not betray the slightest sign of surprise, anger or fear of the consequences, but spoke in a calm and composed tone to his *umara*, telling them not to consider the event prejudicial to their cause but, on the contrary, to look upon it as a sure presage of victory, adding "If the traitor had acted like this during an action our cause would have been irretrievably lost. Let us therefore thank God for timely winnowing foes from friends." A few months later, at the request of

a very loyal and able general, Aurangzeb granted the same traitor absolute amnesty. In magnanimity he was unparalleled. In the battle of Samugarh when his army was beaten back, and he was reduced to a helpless condition and it seemed but the work of a few moments to complete his destruction, the following incident occurred. A Rajput chief, dismounting from his horse, attempted to cut the girths of Aurangzeb's elephant in order to throw him down and kill him. His body-guard attacked the Rajput but Aurangzeb cried out "Do not kill the man, he is a hero." But it was too late. In the Battle of Golkonda a similar incident occurred which I quote below from Mr. Lane-Poole's *Aurangzeb*.

"Many of the nobles of Golkonda had from time to time gone over to the enemy, and at length only two chiefs remained loyal to the king, Abdul Razzak and Abdullah Khan. Both had been plied with rich promises by Aurangzeb. Abdul Razzak ungracious, faithful fellow, as his friend the historian relates, taking no heed of his own interest and life, showed the emperor's letter to the men in his bastion, and tore it to shreds before them. He told the spy who brought it to make answer that he would fight to the death, even as they fought who did battle for the blessed Husain at Kerbela. But his colleague, Abdullah Khan, was open to a bribe. He had charge of a postern gate, and admitted the enemy. The Mughals poured into the fortress, and raised a shout of triumph. Abdul

Razzak heard it, and leaping a barebacked horse, on followed by a dozen retainers, galloped to the gate through which the enemy were rushing in. He threw himself alone into their midst, crying that he would die for Abul Hasan. Covered with blood and reeling in his saddle, he fought his way out, and they found him next day lying senseless under a cocoa-nut tree, with more than seventy wounds."

"The hero of the siege was Abdul Razzak. Aurangzeb said that had Abul Hasan possessed but one more servant as loyal as this, the siege might have gone on much longer. He sent a European and a Hindu surgeon to attend to the wounded man, and rejoiced when after 16 days he at last opened his eyes. He showered favours upon the hero's sons, but nothing could shake the loyalty of the father. Lying on his sick-bed he said, that no man who had eaten the salt of Abul Hasan could enter the service of Aurangzeb. Among the universal self-seeking of the Mughal court, such faithfulness was rare indeed, and no one honoured it more sincerely than the Emperor who had never been disloyal to his standard of duty."

Innumerable instances of his mercy, charity, generosity, compassion and magnanimity have been related in histories, but space does not allow me to cite more of them.

One might object to Aurangzeb's practice of winning over officers of the enemy by promises of favours and rewards as unfair. It may be true in particular

cases, but during hostilities the social and moral laws of peace-time cannot be adhered to. Murdering, plundering, deceiving, and doing any sort of injury to others, are universally held to be sin and crime, and punishable by civil laws. But the same acts are held glorious and heroic when performed in war, when one has no choice of action or free-will, so cannot choose a highly moral line of action, but is every moment compelled to act according to sudden unforeseen circumstances. The universal rule admitted on all hands in conducting war is, 'To act in such a way as to minimise the horrors of war as far as possible and to bring it to a speedy conclusion.' There is a most necessary condition and indispensable clause of the above proposition, viz. 'each party keeping always in view its own advantage and object.' This I have purposely left out, not being able to understand why, how or where to put it in the sentence, it is so absurd and contradictory, for without this condition war is impossible. However it may be this is the substance of the rule universally admitted, directly or indirectly, by word or action, for conducting war. If Aurangzeb, to save enormous expenditure of money, dreadful loss of life, and the unbearable hardships of long wars, could succeed in bringing the war to a speedy conclusion by offers of favours and rewards to officers of the enemy, he acted in accordance with the universally admitted rule given above. By minimising the horrors of war in this manner Aurangzeb showed the highest degree of strategy and statesmanship. What

are the civilised nations compelled to do in the present Great War? Buying over enemy-officers and troops is even now not out of the question, for if reports are to be credited it has been tried—though in vain—by one nation at least; and if peace and a speedy conclusion of this horrible war could be bought at any expense of money, it would not be bought too dearly.



CHAPTER V.

Now I proceed to examine the same question from a different point of view. There are certainly some actions of Aurangzeb's which, if viewed in the light of present politics, seem improper. But the merit of events of past ages ought not to be judged by the standard of modern politics. Because the human species is progressive, it generally attains a higher and better state in every succeeding age as compared with the preceding. This is the natural law and therefore unchangeable. Men can be reasonably held responsible for those acts only in which they have their choice. But every age must necessarily be in a lower state than its successor, so for this kind of difference neither the preceding ages are blamable nor the succeeding ones praiseworthy. According to the rule of adaptation the peculiar conditions and circumstances of every age mould the human mind in a particular shape from which corresponding thoughts and acts result. There is but very small margin left for choice. What thoughts and acts are sanctioned by the whole or the majority of the people of any age and nation ought to be held lawful and reasonable for those people; but what is condemned by the whole or the majority as sin, crime, or vice should be denounced as such by critics of the age whether contemporary or succeeding. There were

many things in past ages which were not only allowable but praiseworthy in those days, but according to the standard of modern politics they would be held in great horror as atrocious, cruel, foolish and unjust. According to the law of progress our highly prudent institutions will certainly be as severely criticised by succeeding generations as we now criticise those of our predecessors. When such is the case we ought to imagine ourselves in the position of the people and age whose acts we are going to criticise, to feel what they felt, and to think what they thought, to be in a position to criticise their acts justly. But the modern critics of Aurangzeb have totally neglected these simple rules in passing their severe and unjust judgment upon him, of whom Mr. S. L. Poole justly says "The great puritan of India was of such stuff as wins the martyr's crown."

To explain my above observations more clearly I offer a few illustrations of ancient institutions which were perfectly justifiable in past ages, but are now held in great abomination in the light of modern politics and social rules. Slavery, polygamy, and religious persecution were formerly considered not only allowable but most necessary for self-preservation, and highly beneficial to human society. In ancient times small communities of people generally formed independent states in obedience to the spontaneous impulse of social nature. These small states often clashed with one another to obtain the necessaries of life and the means of comfort and luxury. The numerically stronger states generally

overcame the smaller and weaker ones, and deprived them of their possessions, killing those members who resisted. It became, by experience, clear to all that numerical strength was the chief and only means of preserving the lives of individuals and the existence of society. Then by the guidance of the natural impulse of self-preservation, the institutions of polygamy and slavery were gradually established among them. The common occurrence of warfare in those days diminished the number of men in each community. The women, who naturally depended upon the men for protection and support, were found in greater number than the opposite sex. This state alone was sufficient to justify polygamy. Besides this, polygamy was one sure means of multiplying the number of the citizens of states, therefore this institution became most necessary and most beneficial to society. The second institution, slavery, arose also from the same cause. When women and children of a defeated nation were captured and made slaves by the conquerors, the latter increased in number and the conquered decreased. Thus slavery and polygamy came into existence from the necessity of self-preservation.

Religious intolerance and persecution are based upon a fundamental principle of politics. Man is a social being, he must live in society. The supply of his wants, his comfort, progress, protection, and every other desirable object depend upon the co-operation, mutual help, and reciprocal sympathies of the members.

the great law-giver, and his successors made a clean sweep of the Canaanites and others to establish the Israelitish kingdom in peace. The Christians, as soon as they got the opportunity, forced the whole of Europe into Christendom, directly or indirectly. The Muhammadans also followed in the footsteps of their predecessors, but in a milder and more tolerable manner. In the 17th and 18th centuries the persecution of Dissenters and Jews was carried out in Europe with such severity that the Jews and even the Protestants were forced to take refuge in the Turkish dominions. Aurangzeb's measures for obtaining the same object were much milder compared with his contemporary kings and nations of Europe. The aim and object of religious persecution is a profound social policy, but the methods and means adopted to accomplish that object have varied in different ages and different nations according to their peculiar circumstances and intellectual culture. Even the Hindus (whose religion was originally a non-missionary one) when they first migrated to India from Central Asia, treated the aborigines more cruelly than Muslims or Christians, destroying them, expelling them from their country, reducing them to abject servitude and prohibiting them from improving their condition in any direction. I therefore beg my kind readers, Hindus and Christians, to observe the very wise and just admonition of one of the greatest teachers the world has ever known when criticising others. "And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's

eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?.....First cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

Religious persecution still continues in every country and every nation, though, according to present conditions, the method and form of that tyranny have changed and it appears in a comparatively mild aspect. Europe is now enjoying the blessed fruits of the unity of religion, and it is only through the antagonism of interests and difference of races that conflicts crop up now and then.

Our present institutions, which are universally admitted to be right and necessary for maintaining order, peace and liberty, on being examined closely are found totally unjust and unreasonable. Take criminal law for instance. It enjoins capital punishment, imprisonment or transportation for life in certain classes of crime. That the convict deserves punishment there is no question, but the necessary result of this act is to make his innocent wife a widow and his children orphans, or in other words to make his wife and children, as well as other dependents, suffer by depriving them of his support. These innocent people, who were not accomplices in his crime, are put to great pain and distress by a voluntary and deliberate act of the government. The offender by his crime did an amount of injury to society. The government in punishing the culprit increases that amount of injury to society. The offender committed

the crime under some kind of stress or provocation; the government inflicts the injury to society and its innocent members deliberately. The object of capital punishment is not to correct the offender but to deter others from committing such offences. Its deterring effect is very doubtful, but its injurious effect upon the offender's dependents is certain and real.

The only possible and plausible excuse for this and similar acts is, that in the present condition of society, nothing better is conceivable.

"When better choices are not to be had,

We needs must take the seeming best of bad."

In this way in every department of our social life unjust and unreasonable rules and usages are found. In the same way as we denounce our predecessors' acts, our acts will be judged by our successors. "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

Aurangzeb's sincere and firm faith in the truth of his religion as the sole means of salvation, combined with his philanthropic turn of mind, induced him to take every possible, reasonable and practicable measure to persuade Non-Muslims to adopt Islam as their religion and renounce idolatry and the dark path of ignorance. He could not do otherwise, because, if he did not earnestly desire that all people should be converted, it proved one of two alternatives,—either he did not believe firmly in the truth of Islam, or he did not love mankind. But he did both, therefore his desire of converting Non-Muslims was based on his convictions

and love. Nevertheless his religious ardour and philanthropic passion did not carry him too far. He adopted very mild, very wise and very just measures to effect that object. All historians, Muslim, Hindu, and Christian, are unanimous regarding the fact that Aurangzeb never used torture or execution on account of religion: he never forced anybody to adopt Islam. If anyone was converted to Islam he showed him much favour, and in this way he induced people to become Muslims. In some rare cases he asked criminals, who were doomed to death, if they wished to become Muslims. But in such cases his chief motive was to save life. Aurangzeb could not save the life of a culprit who was sentenced to death by law. But he believed that by conversion all past sins (including crimes) were forgiven, and therefore the sentence of death could also be revoked. So conversion in such cases, according to Aurangzeb's idea, was of double service. It saved man's life in this world and his soul in the next.

It is true that by Aurangzeb's order some temples and schools were pulled down in Benares, Multan and Muthra; but it was a kind of mental punishment, that Aurangzeb used in other cases also. When a judge, for instance, passed wrong judgment or was influenced by partiality to a party or by a bribe, he was called to the court, stripped of all his state and honours, was required to attend the court every day and thus was humiliated in the presence of other Umara; and after punishing him for some days in this way he was either

pardoned and restored to his post or, if the offence was very serious, dismissed for good. He was informed that the Hindus in the above-named cities taught Muslim boys their pernicious and superstitious sciences. This fact provoked him and consequently he ordered the demolition of the schools and temples of the offenders to give them mental pain as a punishment for their offence.

Aurangzeb's proposal to remove all Hindus from high posts in the government was due to some political precautions. When the Rajputs were assuming independence, and the Mahrattas were revolting against the empire Aurangzeb lost faith in Hindu officials and therefore ordered their removal from high positions of trust.

The *jazia* tax has been generally regarded by Non-Muslims, particularly Christians, as a very exorbitant and unjust burden laid by Islam upon Non-Muslim subjects as a penalty for infidelity.

This blame is very unjust and untrue. If government has the right of imposing any taxes whatever upon the people then *jazia* also is a lawful demand. An Islamic government is bound to afford equal protection to the life, property and liberty of every subject, Muslim and Non-Muslim. The latter are permitted to live, labour and trade in peace and prosperity. They are not forced to serve the government. Muslims have to pay many taxes from which Non-Muslims are free. But the government in affording equal protection to

both classes has to spend money. Muslims help the government both by money and free military service from which latter form of service Non-Muslims are exempted. In such circumstances imposing some tax upon them is perfectly justifiable. The method of its assessment is very reasonable. The women and children, the old, the poor, the infirm, and those, who through disease have been unable to earn their livelihood for six months or more, are exempt from this tax. On the rest a moderate amount is imposed yearly. The amount ought not to exceed the subject's ability to pay it. If Non-Muslims serve the government they are exempted from this tax. What can be fairer? Some sovereigns have modified these rules according to the requirements of particular circumstances.

Aurangzeb abolished all taxes that were not sanctioned by Islam. The exchequer thus lost about five millions sterling a year. When the Rajputs gave up serving government, Aurangzeb could not force them to serve according to the law, but he was allowed by Islam to impose *jazia* on them and such as did not serve the government but were served by it. He imposed *jazia* also on the traders and merchants of Delhi and other parts of the kingdom. The people generally murmured against this new imposition and tried to avoid it. But protest against it was partly due to the peoples' exemption from it since Akbars' time, and partly to Aurangzeb's extreme leniency. In India, all the sovereigns before Akbar had levied *jazia* and no

one was ever able to protest against it. When Aurangzeb abolished about eighty taxes no one thanked him for his generosity, but when he imposed only one tax, not heavy at all, the people began to show their displeasure.

Aurangzeb granted a few privileges to Mohamedans in view of this class being the sole supporters of the government; but whether from religious or political considerations or both combined they were not very considerable.



CHAPTER VI.

If Aurangzeb's character be examined from the rationalistic point of view it will be found full of flaws. I mention here a few of them which are most prominent and conspicuous.

"Aurangzeb did not make use of punishment," says Khafi Khān, "and without punishment the administration of a country cannot be maintained." This is perfectly true. When Aurangzeb was waging war with the Mahrattas in the Deccan, Sambhaji, Sivaji's son, was captured and brought before the emperor. He used to butcher and plunder people as well as dishonour women and burn villages. The people of the country greatly rejoiced to hear of this robber's capture. Aurangzeb asked the prisoner if he wished to turn Muslim. He thereupon uttered very shameful and abusive words. He was then put to death. This was the only punishment that Aurangzeb ever inflicted during his reign of fifty years. "His brother Raja Ram," says S. L. Poole, "fled to Jinji in the Carnatic, as remote as possible from the Mughal headquarters. For the moment the Mahratta power seemed to come to an end. The brigands were awed awhile by the commanding personality and irresistible force of the great Mughal." But the emperor reverted to his non-punishing policy again. Though he continued to ad-

vance into the enemys' country, driving them back and capturing their fortresses for a considerable time—over fifteen years—the Mahrattas were not completely subdued. They fled from one place to another, hid themselves in out-of-the-way recesses and issued forth to attack and plunder small parties like convoys of rations and ammunition for the army. The emperor continued to chase them but they, being very nimble and energetic, got out of danger's way very quickly and hid themselves in places inaccessible to foreign invaders. Their country, very rugged and rocky, afforded them great protection. They were like the north-western frontier tribes of Hindustan who still sometimes disturb the peace of the neighbouring government dominions, and who have been punished several times, but only scotched, not killed. Being ignorant and barbarous tribes destitute of power, resources and organisation, wholly unable to face the government troops in the plains, they, nevertheless, continued to defy General Lockhart's forces for a long time in their native hills. In the same way the Mahrattas, though chased and hunted by the Mughal army for a long time, could not be totally subdued in their hilly country. But the emperor, who had an iron will, continued to harass them as long as he lived. Aurangzeb was not the man to look back when he once put his hand to the plough.

I quote below a short description, by Mr. S. L. Poole, of the old emperor's conduct in the Deccan Wars which seems very interesting.

“The marvellous thing about this wearisome campaign of twenty years is the way in which the brave old emperor endured its many hardships and disappointments. It was he who planned every campaign, issued all the general orders, selected the points for attack and the lines of entrenchment, and controlled every movement of his various divisions in the Deccan. He conducted many of the sieges in person, and when a mine exploded among the besiegers at Sattara, in 1699, and general despondency fell on the army, the octogenarian mounted his horse and rode to the scene of disaster, as if in search of death. He piled the bodies of the dead into a human ravelin, and was with difficulty prevented from leading the assault himself. He was still the man who had chained his elephant at the battle of Samugarh forty years before. Nor was his energy confined to the overwhelming anxieties of the war. His orders extended to affairs in Afghanistan and disturbances at Agra; he even thought of retaking Kandahar. Not an officer, not a government clerk, was appointed without his knowledge, and the conduct of the whole official staff was vigilantly scrutinised with the aid of an army of spies.

We are fortunate in possessing a portrait of Aurangzeb as he appeared in the midst of his Deccan campaigns. On Monday, the 21st of March, 1695, Dr. Gemelli Careri was admitted to an audience of the Emperor in his quarters, called Gulalbar, at the camp of Galgala. He saw an old man with a white beard,

trimmed round, contrasting vividly with his olive skin; 'he' was of low stature, with a large nose, slender and 'stooping with age.' Sitting upon rich carpets, and leaning against gold-embroidered cushions, he received the Neapolitan courteously, asked his business in the camp, and being told of Careri's travels in Turkey, made inquiries about the war then raging between the Sultan and the princes of Hungary. The doctor saw him again at the public audience in a great tent pitched within a court enclosed by screens of painted calico. The Moghul appeared leaning on a crutched staff, preceded by several nobles. He was simply dressed in a white robe tied under the right arm with a silk sash from which his dagger hung. On his head was a white turban bound with a gold web, 'on which an emerald of a vast bigness appeared amidst four 'little ones. His shoes were after the Moorish fashion, 'and his legs naked without hose.' He took his seat upon a square gilt throne raised two steps above the dais, inclosed with silver banisters; three brocaded pillows formed the sides and back, and in front was a little silver footstool. Over his head a servant held a green umbrella to keep off the sun, whilst two others whisked the flies away with long white horse-tails. 'When he was seated they gave him his scimitar and 'buckler, which he laid down on his left side within 'the throne. Then he made a sign with his hand for 'those that had business to draw near, who being come 'up, two secretaries, standing, took their petitions, which

'they delivered to the king, telling him the contents: 'I admir'd to see him indorse them with his own hand, 'without spectacles, and by his cheerful smiling countenance seemed to be pleased with the employment.'

"It is a striking picture of the vigorous old age of one who allowed no faculty of his active mind to rust, no spring of his spare frame to relax" (S. L. Poole's *Medieval India*. P. 403-405).

If the Emperor had inflicted just punishment on the leaders of revolt only once or twice a year he would probably have soon succeeded in subduing the Mah-rattas.

Another of Aurangzeb's great faults was his almost total disregard of worldly means for securing his objects. He always used to say that victory and defeat did not depend upon the strength of the army and skill of the leaders, but solely upon the will of God. His conviction in this particular was manifest in all his actions. He never despaired of success in any condition whatever. When he was on the point of being defeated, captured or killed in the Battle of Samugarh, his indomitable courage did not give way; his firm belief in the justice of his cause, and strong hope of heavenly help were the same at that critical moment as they were when he was yet marshalling his forces for the encounter. He knew very well that the people of his army were not the hardy mountaineers of Afghanistan or Mughalistan. The province of Kabul still belonged to his empire, and from that country he could easily have

recruited his army with soldiers that would have fought like those valiant soldiers of Mahmud of Ghazni or Babar, and who would have kept the Indian Empire in the strongest possible state indefinitely. But he regarded such considerations as human weakness and lack of faith in the Omnipresent, Omniscient and Omnipotent God. He never troubled himself with such concerns. Again, knowing Raja Jaswant Singh to be a sincere friend and zealous advocate of Dara's cause, and his own State of Jodhpur bordering on the Province of Gujrat, still Aurangzeb sent him there as Governor at a time when Dara was in its vicinity. Such was the character of the emperor that he set aside all prudence and ordinary precautions for self-defence, to exercise the virtue of clemency, implicitly trusting in God for consequent events. When the Mahratta power was at its zenith, Ahmad Shah Abdali, with a much smaller number of Pathan troops, fought with the Mahratta's overwhelming forces combined with *Delhi troops*, at Panipat in 1761, and nearly annihilated them and made an end of the Mahratta ascendancy in Hindustan. Had Aurangzeb adopted such means, which were entirely at his disposal, he would have obtained more brilliant successes than any of his predecessors. But unfortunately he looked on such measures contemptuously.

His third fault was that he always acted under the influence of the impulses produced by present circumstances; he took no thought for the morrow, nor had the impression of the dead past any influence over him.

Illustrations of this principle of his conduct have already been clearly shown in his dealings with his brothers and father. He knew from the first that Sivaji was the most dangerous enemy of the empire, and of a most perverted and incorrigible nature. He constantly warned all his Deccan officials to be always cautious and on the alert to repulse and prevent Sivaji's raids into the country. When Raja Jai Singh defeated Sivaji he made with him a treaty of peace on very advantageous terms, and then begged the emperor not only to forgive him but to show him favours. The simple Raja did not know what a dangerous step he was taking. He thought Sivaji a man possessing at least a common-sense view of honour. He believed all what he said. The emperor forgave Jaswant Singh's treason on Jai Singh's intercession because he did not believe him as dangerous as Sivaji, so he granted him perfect amnesty. But now, in Sivaji's case the emperor hesitated. Raja Jai Singh and Mir Jumla were his ablest and most loyal generals. He never liked to refuse them any favour. Raja Jai Singh now interceded on Sivaji's behalf. Aurangzeb granted the Raja's request in form only, and on Sivaji's arrival at Delhi received him with honour. But at court Aurangzeb could not dissimulate his mental attitude towards him and treated him less courteously than he expected. Sivaji being very shrewd, read the emperor's thoughts and complained of them to Kumar Ram Singh, Raja Jai Singh's son. The emperor appointed a guard about his residence, and

sent a letter to Jai Singh informing him of Sivaji's incorrigible nature, which made him unworthy of the favours he recommended. Sivaji somehow contrived to escape from Delhi, so the emperor was frustrated in his design of putting him in prison. Aurangzeb lost his chance on account of Raja Jai Singh's intercession for Sivaji, though he knew very well what kind of man Sivaji was and how he ought to be dealt with. He left Sivaji's affair for a long time to his *subadars* and *umara* of the Deccan. He tried every one of them and found all wanting. So, when he saw the Mahratta danger imminent, he himself set out to take command of the Mahratta expedition. He first conquered the Deccan kingdoms of Bijapur and Golkonda which were great and formidable obstacles in his way. After settling their business he pursued the main object of his expedition—the subjugation of the Mahrattas.

Some historians consider the cold, suspicious nature of Aurangzeb's treatment of Sivaji as a great political blunder due to bigotry. They say that Aurangzeb by wise treatment could have converted Sivaji into a very useful ally. This is a great mistake. Aurangzeb loved Jai Singh as a very loyal and devoted friend though he was a Hindu. He knew that Sivaji was a wolf who could not be safely trusted to watch the sheep. If Aurangzeb had put the slightest confidence in him he would have taken advantage of it at the expense of the empire's integrity and peace. His desire was simply to obtain the governorship of the

Daccan. If this favour had been granted him its result is not difficult to comprehend. Sivaji, several years previously, begged the Bijapur king to send his general Afzal Khan to settle some treaty with him. Feigning to be afraid to go himself into his camp he called to his fort the unwary general, unarmed and unattended by any guard, and then pretending to embrace him killed him with a weapon hidden in his sleeve for this purpose.

His fourth fault was that his religious frame of mind was too sensitive. Even in matters of minor importance he was very strict. He banished music from his court as too sensual a pleasure for Muslims. When the musicians, pretending to carry the body of Music who had died, passed under the palace window wailing and lamenting, the emperor on ascertaining the cause directed them to bury it deep down in the ground that it might not rise again. If any singer, dancer, or player on musical instruments abandoned his profession he was shown great favour in the form of a liberal pension, and, at times, even a grant of rent-free land. He gave up, as a sort of idolatry, the time-honoured custom of the Mughal emperors of appearing at the levee window daily to receive the peoples' salaams. After ten years of his reign he prohibited people from writing his history considering it vanity and conceit. He gradually gave up all things savouring of sensuality, pride, vanity and selfishness.

According to Islamic law Non-Moslem subjects were

not forced to serve a Muslim government, and the Muslim authorities had no right to demand service from them. But from Akbar's time it was made compulsory for Rajput chiefs to serve the government. When these people perceived Aurangzeb's indifference towards them they gradually gave up attending the court and serving in the field. Aurangzeb did not mind that, but he wanted to retain his suzerainty over them to avoid conflict and disorder. The Rajputs required absolute freedom.

Raja Jaswant Singh died while he was Governor of Kabul, in the 22nd year of Aurangzeb's reign, and up to that time had no children. Three months after his death it was reported to the emperor that two of Jaswant Singh's *ranis*, who were with child at the time of his death, were, on reaching Lahore, delivered of two sons on the same day. The emperor ordered the mothers and children to come and stay at Delhi under royal wardship, till the children attained the age of discretion. During this interval the children would have had *jagirs* from the Jodhpur State assigned them, and the Jodhpur nobility would have been granted suitable *jagirs* and the state placed under government management. The attendants of the *ranis* and children, fearing the discovery of the spuriousness of the children that might result in the annexation of the State, took the *ranis* and their children clandestinely to Jodhpur. This contumacious conduct of the Rajputs led to a short war with the Jodhpur and Udaipur States.

Some historians consider that Aurangzeb wished to detain the children of the raja at Delhi for the purpose of converting them. "He endeavoured to get Jaswant Singh's two sons sent to Delhi to be educated, and doubtless made Muslims, under his own supervision." (S. L. Poole's *Aurangzeb*, p. 139). But in the whole history of Aurangzeb I do not find a single instance of such forced conversion. Sivaji's son, Sambhaji, was executed and his son Sahu was brought up at the court. He was assigned a great *jagir* and *mansab* and after attaining the age of discretion was sent back to his *jagir* as much a Hindu as he was when taken under wardship.

Mr. S. L. Poole here seems to have been biassed by the missionary stories of the spread of Islam by force, leading him to believe that the emperor's real object in keeping Jaswant Singh's sons under his supervision was to make them Muslims. I wonder he makes such obvious mistakes being himself well versed in the history of Islam as well as that of Aurangzeb. Bernier often fabricates stories but the serious writer ought not to imitate or follow him.

CHAPTER VII.

Aurangzeb may have been a bigot, a fanatic, an ambitious or a wrong-headed monarch, but in his character and conduct he was certainly infinitely in advance of his age. He honoured and favoured his bitterest foes if they were worthy. His elder sister Jahanara, who was always intriguing against him and siding with Dara, was forgiven when Aurangzeb ascended the throne; and he forgot all her ill-behaviour towards him, granting her the same allowances and the same position that she enjoyed in Shahjahan's time. His histories are full of such instances. I need not dwell upon them here any longer.

Aurangzeb never allowed the capture of women and children during war as was the common practice in Asia in those days. In all his wars and conquests the life and property of the subject were protected and respected. Prisoners of war were never punished. The great rebels and traitors were immediately pardoned on their repenting. He never made slaves of the prisoners of war. In judicial matters, civil or criminal, he never interfered, and left every case to be tried by judges and decided by law according to its merits. He never arrogated despotic power in any matter whatever. It was simply in war and peace where he considered himself privileged to interfere, but in these cases

also he generally held consultation with his *umara* before acting. He issued an edict permitting all subjects and private persons to sue government in courts of law if they had any claim upon it and wanted satisfaction. Government advocates were appointed in every district to plead for the government in any law-suits brought against it by subjects. I have already quoted *Alexander Dow*, in the third chapter, showing what useful public works and institutions were started by Aurangzeb. His private life was also exemplary. Out of the 24 hours he spent nearly twelve in public business, four in worship and devotion, while the remaining eight hours were devoted to meals, sleep, and other private concerns. He had only one or two wives at a time while Akbar had over five thousand. He was strictly temperate and abstemious in his habits.

It is not unusual for idle people to invent extraordinary stories about great men's lives. Aurangzeb could not be an exception. A story has been invented for instance that Aurangzeb fell in love with a maid-servant of his aunt. On seeing her in a state of intoxication and singing very sweetly his heart was captivated by her unparalleled charms and he fell into a swoon. Seeing his condition, and considering it physical illness, his aunt was much alarmed. After trying for some time to bring him round he opened his eyes, and being asked about the fit he had to confide the secret to his aunt. After securing the charming mis-

tress Aurangzeb was tempted by her to drink wine. The passion for her was so strong that he gave up all thought of religion and applied the cup to his lips. Thereupon the enchantress snatched the cup from his hand and remarked that she was simply sounding the depth of his love.

Such stories are invented by idle people for their own amusement and by novelists for others, but historians and searchers for truth ought to use sound methods of judgment in selecting materials for the subject of their writings. Every man of common sense, who knows Aurangzeb well, will reject such stories as fictitious. Aurangzeb's heart, from his youth onwards, was proof against vicious temptations and low passions of this kind. The character once formed and firmly established is rarely, if ever, changed. Only credulous people who believe in fairy tales, can believe such inconsistencies. It is not less monstrous than one related by Dr. Bernier, viz. that a eunuch fell in love with a Hindu woman in Delhi. Both lovers being found together one night were murdered by the woman's brother. Other eunuchs were greatly excited over their comrade's murder, and the murderer's life was only saved by his turning Muslim. Such stories have no more historical value than those of Dick Turpin, Don Quixote, or Alif Leila. I am surprised that Mr. J. N. Sarkar also relates this love story of Aurangzeb in his most valuable book *History of Aurangzeb*.

It has been suspected by some people that Aurangzeb

wrote fictitious and fraudulent letters to some allies or officials of the enemy and planned to send them in such a way that they should fall into the enemy's hands. When the enemy read such letters he was convinced of the treason or conspiracy of the addressee. But this kind of treachery on his part has never been proved from any reliable source. They are vile calumnies fabricated by his enemies and detractors.*

It is certain he was the greatest and best monarch that ever governed India, and it is as certain difficult to find in the history of the world a combination of so many good qualities in a single person. He governed a vast empire with great ability and strength; and he governed himself with still greater ability and vigour. There have been many great sovereigns in the world,—Alexander the Great, Napoleon Bonaparte, Charles XII of Sweden, Salahuddin, Chengiz Khan, Timur and others,—who might have equalled or excelled him in one or a few qualities but not in the aggregate, excepting perhaps Salahuddin who much resembled Aurangzeb in piety, virtue and generosity. It is also difficult to find among the rulers of the world such as can rule themselves also.

“Aurangzeb was the last of the great Mughals, in all save the name. He had been by far the most powerful of the line; he had ruled wider territories and commanded vaster armies than Akbar; and he had

* See Appendix.

governed his teeming populations with an absolute despotism in which no other man had a voice. What Akbar achieved by broad-minded statesmanship, and Shahjahan by imposing majesty and panoplied array, Aurangzeb accomplished by the exercise of an iron will and indomitable personal labour. Through the greater part of his long reign no sovereign was ever more abjectly feared and obeyed; none certainly showed a more marvellous grasp of administration." (S. L. Poole's *Medieval India*, p. 410).

I need not make any comment on the above remark except on the words "abjectly feared" which contradict Khafî Khan who says "No fear of punishment remained throughout the kingdom."

His secret of success in this particular lay really in his indefatigable supervision and labour. If the vastness of the empire, with its great variety of religions and races, which he governed, and the length of his reign, be taken into account, he may be safely considered unparalleled. He conquered the whole of the Deccan and Aracan, he made the Great Tibet his protectorate, and his armies overran Assam and obtained a great amount of tribute from that State, though it was not occupied permanently.

The subjoined tabular statement, taken from reliable sources, shows the greatest increase of government revenue in Aurangzeb's reign.

Towards the end of Akbar's reign the revenue was £18,640,000

"	Jahangir's	"	£19,680,000
---	------------	---	-------------

Towards the end of Shahjahan's reign the revenue was	£30,080,000
In the beginning of Aurangzeb's	„ £25,410,000
Towards the end of Aurangzeb's	„ £43,550,000

for the years 1594, 1627, 1655, 1660 and 1697 respectively.

The above figures show that the revenue of the Mughal Empire in India towards the end of Aurangzeb's reign was more than double of that towards the end of Akbar's reign. The increase of revenue towards the end of Shahjahan's reign over that of Akbar's was 50 per cent. In the beginning of Aurangzeb's reign there was a fall of about four-and-a-half millions sterling, evidently due to his abolishing many taxes, about eighty in number, on his ascending the throne. It was after the conquests of the Deccan and Aracan that the government revenue reached its highest point.

Khafi Khan has made the following remark about Aurangzeb, in his history. "Every plan he made came to naught and every enterprise failed." He evidently alludes to the Mahratta expedition when Aurangzeb had grown very old and his armies—partly through the vices of luxury and love of ease resulting from a long period of peace and prosperity, and partly through long residence in India and admixture of Indian blood—had become physically and morally less efficient. But European historians seem to take it in a general sense, and quote it to show that Aurangzeb's reign was, owing to his bigotry and mistaken policy, a series of total failures. But this opinion is exactly the reverse

of the facts that the Indian histories unanimously prove. His career was more successful than that of any other Indian sovereign, even more than that of the great Akbar. Akbar had to deal with petty and less powerful states of India, and still their subjugation took more than forty years of strenuous exertion. Aurangzeb, on the contrary, had to deal with every powerful kings of Hindustan possessing and weilding great powers, resources and armies. I mean Murad, Shuja and Dara who had even the old lion Shahjahan on his side. Aurangzeb, against so many odds, triumphed over all his rivals within eighteen months. Such a quick and perfect triumph over such formidable enemies, and with comparatively small means and resources, stands confessed by historians as unparalleled in the history of the world. Alexander's long spears overcame petty nations who did not use those weapons, but even Alexander experienced in India a great check to his advance. After Aurangzeb's complete conquest a period of peace and prosperity followed, which lasted twenty years, unparalleled in the annals of India. It was during this period that Aracar, the country of pirates and robbers, was conquered and annexed, Greater Tibet put under his protectorate, Assam overrun by the imperial forces and a large amount of tribute obtained from the audacious people of that country. These were considered extraordinary and unprecedented events in those days. The establishment of universities, schools, public libraries, and the building of

serais on the roads for the accommodation of wayfarers, etc., were all the outcome of that peaceful period of Aurangzeb's reign.

Owing to various causes, previously mentioned, some disturbance in the kingdom afterwards commenced. But such events were not unusual in India in those days. In Jahangir's and Shahjahan's reigns such disturbances were more common. But Aurangzeb's triumph over the Deccan was again a great success. All the sovereigns of India, who were more ambitious than others, attempted to conquer and annex the Deccan but were invariably disappointed. Alauddin Khilji and Muhammad Taghlaq temporarily achieved some measure of success in this direction; Akbar made very little progress; Jahangir made none; while Shahjahan succeeded only partially. It was Aurangzeb alone who was destined to achieve this much desired object. After this he had to struggle long to suppress the Mahratta power, which he and his son after him kept in check as long as they lived. This was not a small success. After his son's short reign the Mahrattas overran almost the whole of India in less than forty years. Aurangzeb's whole life was more successful than that of any other Indian king. The jealousies among the *umara*, the degeneracy of the north-western races residing long in India who formed the bulk of the Mughal army, and the rise of the Mahrattas whose native country afforded them good shelter against foreign invasion, were the new emergencies that Aurang-

zeb, being in extreme old age, could not meet so successfully as he used to do previously. Under such circumstances he did more than could be expected from any other sovereign of India.

When Mir Jumla, coming back from the Assam expedition, died in Bengal, and the report of his death reached the emperor, he deeply grieved over the sad event. Mir Jumla was the best general and the most loyal friend that Aurangzeb ever possessed. He sent his son to condole with the son of the deceased general at his house, and then showered great favours upon the stricken family in the way of affording them consolation. But Mr. S. L. Poole quotes the emperor's remark made for the consolation of the deceased's son in the following words. "You mourn" said Aurangzeb to Mir Jumla's son, "your loving father, and I mourn the most powerful and the most dangerous of my friends." Any Asiatic, of common sense, who knows Mir Jumla and Aurangzeb and their relations with each other, can discern the falsity of the above-quoted remark at first sight, it is so plain. "I mourn the most powerful and the most dangerous of my friends" is equivalent to saying I rejoice at the death of my most powerful and dangerous friend,—because the disappearance of a *powerful danger* is a sure occasion for rejoicing, not for grieving.

In the histories of Aurangzeb, written by Europeans there are many more things of this kind which are really unfounded and worthless.

In conclusion I beg to submit that the old institutions and usages that I have tried to justify, would not be justifiable in these modern times. The circumstances and individual and social conditions have now greatly changed, therefore public institutions and social morals must likewise change.

We have had enough of such religions as made us hate others, now we hope to have enough of a religion that will make us love others. One religion may be as good as another though all its followers may not be equally righteous, pious and good. There are good and bad in every religious community. Our sympathies and the similarity of our wants, sensations, feelings, emotions, passions and sentiments ought to teach us to love one another. We ought to compete in doing good, to try to excel others in what is good, but all ought to be done in a spirit of love. The true principles that make us justify our ancestors ought to teach us to improve ourselves. If our predecessors had not been what they were, we could not be what we are. Every succeeding age is the offspring of the preceding one, therefore the state of the former is the obvious result of the latter.



PART II.

**The criticisms mentioned in the preface,
and notes on the same.**

The criticisms alluded to in the preface.

"It is a thorough-going defence of the great emperor."

"I think Manucci has been dealt with somewhat hypercritically. He is described as 'blossoming forth as a quack doctor? May I relate a personal incident? When I was on plague duty in 1898 and 1899 I was frequently called in to see plague patients and asked to examine even females by villagers in preference to hospital assistants. The villagers certainly credited me with as much knowledge of plague then as they did the medical subordinates. (and perhaps rightly). These summonses annoyed the Civil Surgeons on similar plague duty: but I do not know that they described me as a quack, any more than did the Kashmiris last year, who took my quinine and cascara rather than go to the State hospitals near at hand."

"Nor have I been able to follow Dr. Sadiq Ali's sarcasm as to Manucci's polyglottic capabilities and the doubts he throws on the genuineness of the existing MSS. of the *Storia*. This may be because I have not seen the *Storia* in the original or in the unabridged edition. Mr. L. Irvine says Manucci sent home two copies of his MSS. (plainly in Italian). The first MS. was lent to Catrou who used it for his own purposes. In 1707 this MS. passed with others into the possession

of a book-lover, Baron Gerard Meerman, of the Hague. From him it was bought by a knight of Worcester in England and was finally acquired by the Royal Library at Berlin in 1887. The second copy sent for reasons explained quite satisfactorily, was sent to and entered in the catalogue of the San Marco Library at Venice. A volume of portraits sent to Europe with the first MS. passed into the possession of the National Library in Paris. Is this the origin of the idea that the *Storia* was published or written in French ?”

“I think Manucci must have had some opportunities of observing what went on at Court—*vide* his reference to the inaccuracy of Bernier’s account where he says ‘Nor could he have been too well informed, for he did not live more than eight years at the Mogul Court : it is so very large that there are an infinity of things to observe .’”

“An old Latin writer (Tacitus) describing a Roman emperor remarked tritely that his character was *Inter mala bonaque mixtus*,—or words to that effect . *i.e.* was a compound of good and evil. And this characterisation no doubt applies to Aurangzeb as to most men.”

“The modern tendency is to whitewash everyone in the past. But this tendency may be overdone. . . . There is no doubt, fairly speaking, that Aurangzeb treated his relatives—father, brothers and sons—with great cruelty. This may have been from an instinct of self-preservation. It probably was. Witness the attempt on him, by his fourth son, Mohammad

Akbar, in 1681. In the correspondence between father and son published in the *Modern Review* for January 1915, by Professor J. N. Sarkar, Mohammad Akbar complains of the favour shown by Aurangzeb to his eldest son Shah Alam."

"Probably Aurangzeb was the product of the times: and he found 'the system' too strong for him. Personally religious and, *in some respects*, ascetic he had to surround himself with low-born satellites and wink at the luxury and effeminacy in which the great nobles were sunk. A great strain was put on the system during his reign: and the system collapsed."

"Again I think Dr. Sadiq Ali is too severe on Manucci's adoption of a disguise after Dara's defeat at Samugarh."



Some additional notes in connection with Aurangzeb's history, called forth by the above criticisms.

CHAPTER I.

I beg to quote below a few authors, with a few comments on them where necessary, in explanation, corroboration and defence of what I have mentioned in the foregoing.

"His (Manucci's) medical knowledge must have been limited, but it was evidently sufficient to secure him some professional reputation, perhaps due to the fact that among the blind the one-eyed man is king." (Introduction to *Storia de Mogor* by W. Irvine).

The first clause of this sentence is true, the second doubtful, while the third is certainly untrue. In the 6th century the translations of Arabian medical books were text-books in European Medical Schools, and their influence in European medicine continued to the end of the 18th century. If the Indian Muslim physicians of the 17th century were not in advance of their European colleagues, they were certainly not behind them. I do not quote here from medical histories in proof of my last assertion, it is so generally known to all who have studied any history of medicine. Therefore Manucci could not be justly compared to 'the one-eyed man among the blind.'

" His practice evidently consisted chiefly in bleeding,

purging and actual cautery. He is very proud of the last remedy as a cure for cholera; he refers to it more than once, and, as can be seen in the *Lettres Edifiantes*, strongly recommended it to Father Martin of the Madura Mission." (*Idem*)

In purging, *Yunani hakims* have gone too far. They still purge their patients much more than the followers of any other medical system that I know of. Avicenna's (*Ibn Sina's*) *Materia Medica* contains all the principal purgative medicines which European *materia medicas* of the present day contain, with the exception of a few mineral salts and jalap. It was impossible for Manucci, therefore, to excel native physicians in purging. In bleeding and cauterising he might have excelled Indian barbers who, under the direction of *hakims*, practised these operations, which were much more in vogue in Europe than in India, during the 17th and 18th centuries, though they have always been considered by Muslim physicians two of the principal remedial measures, but were practised by them more judiciously through the instrumentality of barbers. If Manucci practised these operations he must have been looked down upon by the Indians for they would have classed him with barbers, one of whose duties it has always been, in India, to perform such operations. The efficacy of cauterising in cholera is no less ridiculous than excessive bleeding and hot-water-drinking formerly considered by some European doctors panaceas or universal remedies.

There is an old saying current among the Arabs and Persians, viz. "The last remedy in every disease is actual cautery." Though educated practitioners of medicine seem to have given up this idea long ago, yet among the rural classes and common people of both nations named above it is still believed in and acted upon. I think when Manucci travelled through Asia Minor and Persia he saw the operation performed on some cholera patients that subsequently recovered; hence his pretension that cauterising was a specific for cholera.

"He (Manucci) also says he introduced the use of enema which was unknown to native practice." (*Idem*)

Enema has been practised by Arab physicians and Yunani hakims from very remote times down to the present day. All the books on therapeutics and medicine contain this kind of treatment. Manucci, being in India for a very long time, must have known this fact, and possibly learnt its practice from the native barbers. If he did not learn this, and similar things connected with the medical profession, from the physicians of India and their assistants the barbers, where did he get his knowledge and experience? He left Europe while a mere youth, without medical training; and even if he learnt the use of enema from Europeans, through seeing it practised by them somewhere in India, he did not introduce its use. His assertion above quoted seems therefore a deliberate attempt to hoodwink his credulous compatriots.

“But knowing what we do of the healing art in Italy and France in the 17th century, he does not seem to have been so very much behind his European contemporaries.” (*Idem.*)

If this relates to Manucci's skill I do not understand how he could have approached European surgeons who were trained in their profession while he received no training at all ; but if it regards his social position Mr. Irvine is perfectly right, for in the 17th century the surgeons in Europe were classed with inferiors. Even in the 18th century their status was not equal to that of physicians.

In *Garrison's History of Medicine*, p. 328, it is stated “The Prussian army-surgeons of the day (18th century) was ranked above a drummer and beneath a chaplain. Being a barber's apprentice he had to shave the officers, and if he proved delinquent in line of duty he could be beaten with sticks at their instance.”

“Though many European travellers visited India during Aurangzeb's reign and wrote their memoirs concerning this country yet none of them makes any mention of Manucci. This fact clearly shows that Manucci was some very insignificant man not worthy of being noticed by any European traveller. There is only one Italian traveller who mentions Manucci in his book, and Manucci also makes his mention in his own book. This man—Angelo Legrenzi—Manucci mentions in these terms: ‘When I was in the court of Shah Alam in Aurangabad, there arrived a

Venetian physician called Angelo Legrenzi. He had come from Aleppo having quitted the service of The Most Serene Republic, and at the age of thirty-five had set out to seek his fortune afresh. He was possessed with various ideas, and concealed in his mind many thoughts. He came to see me, and presented to me a recommendatory letter from Father Ivo, Capuchin, of Surat. I received him most courteously offering him the use of my house, also to his companion, one Signor Protasio, a noble German Forthwith I appointed him my coadjutor, to secure him more respect, and introduced him into the presence of the head-physician, Muhammad Muqim, with a view to his getting appointment from the prince and an adequate salary, and thus not being hindered from practising At last the hakim asked if he knew what God was. At this question Legrenzi was stunned and said nothing, perceiving that such a demand was equal to dismissal; thus was his joy turned into sorrow. Therefore he went back by the road he had come." (*Introduction to Storia de Mogor*, by W. Irvine, page LXXVI.)

"Legrenzi speaks of Manucci in his book in these terms: 'Besides these paid artillèrymen the prince entertained several medical men, or rather surgeons for practising not only physic but surgery, I do not say in cases of importance, on the contrary, only in more humble operations, such as letting of blood, cupping, blistering, and such like. Among these gentlemen I

had luck to find a fellow-countryman, named Nicolo Manucci, a person with great credit among the nobles, in receipt of the handsomest salary I have heard given in this country—that is three-hundred rupees a month. Such a happy encounter consoled me much, being aware of how rare it is to find Italians there much less a Venetian At these remarks my friend was more upset than before, desirous as he was, by whatever means he could, to induce me to rest beside him and supply him with a little in medicine, devoid as he was of letters and even any knowledge of the arts. I consoled him however on that head by saying that I would remain with him for some months then take my departure at the decline of the season. Then arose rumours of the prince's departure for Delhi before the end of the rains. I had intended, on leaving Surat, to proceed to Golconda and thence to Goa. But it seemed to me preferable to give up that project and to embrace the opportunity of staying on and following the route of my friend, so as to see that royal city with all else that might offer itself." (*Idem.*)

Two contradictory statements about exactly the same events cannot be reconciled: one of them must be false if the other is true. If any evidence or testimony supporting and confirming one of them is found, the truth is easily ascertained. But where there is no external and direct evidence procurable the judgment ought necessarily to be based on the indirect and circumstantial evidence. As the two contradictory state-

ments in question have been made by two persons, we ought first to find out the characters of both and then decide in favour of that one who is the more reliable. Now everyone who has read Manucci's book must have certainly perceived that he was in the habit of calumniating good people maliciously, and fabricating slanderous stories. Governor Pitt of Madras and Mr. S. Lane-Poole, the great oriental historian and scholar, complain of this habit. These critics of Manucci deserve to be relied upon in preference to other European historians writing on Indian affairs. Governor Pitt was in India, in Madras when Manucci was residing there, and was acquainted with him. Mr. S. Lane-Poole is the most eminent oriental scholar and historian that I know of. Besides this, the perusal of *Storia* reveals an infinitely greater number of Manucci's faults to a common-sense and fair-minded Indian Muslim. So much for Manucci who, also, according to his own countryman, Legrenzi, 'Was devoid of letters and even any knowledge of the arts.'

Dr. Angelo Legrenzi, who was very courteously received and shown many favours by Manucci at Aurangabad, was an educated gentleman and therefore much superior in intellectual attainments, acumen and moral capacity to Manucci, so that his evidence, when conflicting with that of Manucci should be more reliable and trustworthy.

Now for the points of divergence. Manucci says Dr. Legrenzi went to Aurangabad in search of employ-

ment; had set out to seek his fortune afresh; and confirms these statements by his endeavour to get him employed by the prince and also by appointing him his own coadjutor. Dr. Legrenzi says that he had intended, on leaving Surat, to proceed from Aurangabad to Golconda and thence to Goa. He did not mean to seek employment at Aurangabad.

Manucci says he appointed Legrenzi as his coadjutor and tried to secure for him a good post and salary, while the latter says that the former was illiterate and uneducated and desired him to stay to 'supply him with a little in medicine.'

Manucci says that Legrenzi, being disappointed in his hope of getting employment, went back by the road he had come; while Legrenzi says that changing his mind he preferred to go to Delhi and see what there was to be seen.

I have not quoted the complete notices of each other given in their respective books for want of space. They both agree in one fact only, viz. that they met each other at Aurangabad. All other statements are either contradictory or at variance.

Manucci, naturally respecting his countryman, may not have given his habit of lying and misrepresentation the same license in writing about him as he was wont to do in regard to the natives of the country. The doctor also, having received liberal hospitality from Manucci in a foreign land, must have been reticent about exposing all the faults and defects that he saw in him.

Manucci's statement that he introduced the doctor to the Head-Hakim,* if it be true, shows that he was acting under the said hakim, like barber-surgeons, in a menial position. Barber-surgeon depending upon hakims and working under their orders to earn their bread is an old custom which still prevails in India.

As to the hakim's asking the doctor if he knew what God was, and his being stunned at this question, and considered that it meant his dismissal, are quaint ideas which seem to be emanations of Manucci's inventive mind. Muslims are taught from their childhood that Jews, Christians and Muhammadans worship the same God and follow the same race of prophets descended from Ibrahim (Abraham). Such a question in this case has no motive or meaning at all except as a joke.

As for Manucci's handsome pay, he himself must have told that to the Venetian doctor. Besides this, Dr. Bernier says that the lowest officials drew from 150 to 700 rupees a month. If this is true then 300 rupees a month is not very creditable for a man who boasts to have been attached to Shah Alam's court. This meagre salary shows that by practising barber-

* According to a common custom among Indian grantees, menial servants, if they are useful, become favourites and are allowed certain privileges, including the introduction of strangers, and soliciting for or speaking on behalf of petitioners. When a European holds a similar position in the service of a grandee he is still more privileged in the matter of introduction etc.

surgery he had lowered his prestige and the estimation in which he ought to have been held as a doctor. Europeans, leading a different and more expensive mode of life, might have been allowed somewhat higher wages even in inferior positions.

"Having now stated the reasons which for many years made the question of Manucci and his history a curious literary problem, and having thrown upon it and upon him all the light that ten years of research have produced, I take my leave of him. I know that this book, and still more its translator and editor are open to adverse criticism;* but of one thing I am convinced, that no fair-minded reader ought to say that Manucci is, *for many pages together, so dull as to be uninteresting and unreadable.*

"Here I may state the reasons which have led me to prepare an English translation instead of bringing out the original text. It is obvious in the first place, that a work in three languages—Italian, French, and Portuguese—would be somewhat of an anomaly. If this be conceded, as I think it must be, it follows [that one of the three languages would have to be preferred, and into it the other portions must be translated." *Idem*, p. LXXX.)

* Mr. Irvine's apprehension that the book was open to adverse criticism, and the palliation that it was certainly amusing (which I consider its only merit, and poor consolation) clearly shows that the translator was alive to the worthlessness of the book as a reliable account of facts.

In spite of ten years' research Mr. Irvine could not succeed in finding out, in any of the great libraries of Europe, Manucci's complete work in one language.

Mr. Irvine says that no European traveller, except Legrenzi, ever mentions Manucci. I think, however, Dr. Bernier once met him and mentions him, but he did not know who he was. The conduct of the man that Bernier describes corresponds so closely with the mental image of Manucci that the perusal of *Storia* has conjured up in my mind, that I think the strange man he describes was probably Manucci.

Commenting on the fair that was held periodically on the banks of the Jumna, where all kinds of dealers and customers gathered together, and where fortune-tellers and astrologers, with their astronomical instruments and zodiac charts, came in great number to foretell people their fortunes, Bernier says, in his *Travels* p. 244, "The most ridiculous of these pretenders to divination was a half-caste Portuguese, a fugitive from Goa. This fellow sat on his carpet as gravely as the rest, and had many customers notwithstanding he could neither read nor write. His only instrument was an old mariner's compass, and his books of astrology a couple of old Romish prayer-books in the Portuguese-language, the pictures of which he pointed out as the signs of the European zodiac. *A tal bestias, tal astrologue* (for such brutes, such as an astrologer), he unblushingly observed to the Jesuit, the Reverend Father Buzee, who saw him at his work."

I am going now to quote from *Oatens Travels in India* an abstract of Manucci's whole life in India taken by the former from the latter's own book, because there are no other data on which to base the facts of his life.

"Manucci spent a lifetime there and wrote a book of the highest value. The history of this book, or rather manuscript, which never saw print till the year 1907, is one of the many literary romances which have been the lot of our travellers' records. Catrou, the French historian of the Mughal empire who wrote in 1705, had access to Manucci's original Manuscript, and though he drew from other sources as well, made Manucci's records the *Fondement* of his work. Manucci's Manuscript then disappeared; and subsequent writers in quoting Catrou, notably Robert Orme and Mr. S. Lane-Poole, have lamented the fact that they had no means of authenticating Catrou's history by a reference to the source from which he derived most of his facts. Mr. Lane-Poole, writing in 1893, and judging by the impression which he had formed of Manucci's work from the version of it in Catrou's history, said that he considered the vanished manuscript to be a work full of errors, to savour strongly of the *Chroniques Scandaleuses* and to be the production of a disappointed underling. He added, however, that the discovery of Manucci's narrative would make Catrou's history invaluable, as it would then be possible to authenticate it by collating it with his sources. A few years ago the *Storia de Mogor* at first came to light at Berlin, having

been forgotten rather than lost during the long interval; and the excellent edition published in India text series has rendered reference to Catrou a work of supererogation. Written originally partly in Italian, partly in French, and partly in Portuguese, it has now been translated into English and practically renders all histories of Aurangzeb's reign to some extent deficient.

“Nícolo Manucci was a native of Venice. In 1653, at the age of fourteen, he ran away from home, and, having entered the service of a certain Viscount Bellemont, accompanied him via Smyrna and Ispahan to Gombroon, whence the two sailed to Surat, reaching that port in January 1656. Not long after, they left by the usual route through Burhanpur and Gwalior for Agra, which he reached safely; but in the course of their journey to Delhi, where the Mughal court had now taken up its residence, * Bellemont died. Manucci, who was still little more than a boy, was now masterless. The struggle, however, between Dara on the one side and Aurangzeb and Murad Bakhsh on the other, had just begun, † and Manucci had no difficulty in obtaining a position as artilleryman in Dara's army.

* This is an error. The Emperor and his court were at Agra at this time. He seems to have coined this story otherwise he could not have made such a mistake.

† Manucci seems to have arrived at Agra in April or May 1658, for the wars of succession had then broken out.

As Bernier was at this time in the retinue of Aurangzeb,* it happens that we are in possession of two independent European accounts of the Battle of Samugarh, written from opposite points of view. The result of the engagement destroyed all Dara's hopes of a throne, and Manucci, who apparently cut no very heroic figure in the conflict fled to Agra, and attached himself in disguise to the army of the victorious Aurangzeb. After witnessing Aurangzeb's seizure of Murad Bakhsh,† he reattached himself to Dara, who was now at Lahore, and accompanied him to Multan and Bhakhar. He was now appointed captain of Dara's artillery, ‡ but upon the capture and execution of Dara was again thrown out of employment, and, as his dislike of Aurangzeb prevented him joining that prince he remained so for some short time. After again visiting Delhi and Agra and travelling in Bengal, Manucci, in the true spirit of the Jack-of-all-trades which he was, blossomed forth into a quack doctor. Finding medicine distasteful, or not sufficiently lucrative or exciting, he again took up the profession of arms, this time in the

* This is an error. Bernier had not then set foot upon Indian soil. He reached India several months later. Lieutenant-Colonel James Tod in his *Antiquities of Rajistan* has fallen into the same error (Vol. II, p. 46).

† This event occurred about the 7th of July, 1658.

‡ In Mughal armies none but the *umara* had the privilege of acting as captains or lieutenants. Manucci acting as a captain of artillery is entirely false.

service of Raja Jai Singh ; and in his capacity of captain of artillery, accompanied Jai Singh into the Deccan * on that leader's appointment to a governorship there. At Aurangabad where Jai Singh amalgamated his forces with those of Shah Alam, Manucci saw, for the first time, the famous Mahratta chief Sivaji. This was in June 1665. After some operations against Bijapur, Manucci resigned his commission, and made his way to Bassein, north of Bombay, where he narrowly escaped the clutches of the Inquisition which was then in full operation in Portuguese India. After fifteen months' stay at Goa, he left the town, disguised as a Portuguese Carmelite friar, and made his way to Agra and Delhi. Manucci now spent six or seven years at Lahore, † and gained a small fortune by his fees for medical advice. He now determined to settle down and enjoy his competency, and selected Salsette Island as the place of his retreat. An unfortunate commercial speculation swallowing up all he possessed, Manucci, after a short period of quiescence, was compelled to become

* Manucci's travelling from Bhakhar to Lahore, Delhi and Agra, then in Bengal, and then commencing medical practice and finding it unsuitable leaving it and going to the Deccan must have taken three or four years at least.

† After leaving Jai Singh's army in 1666, travelling in different countries and staying at Bassein and Goa, he could not get back through Delhi to Lahore before 1670.

a wanderer again. Returning to Delhi, * he was lucky enough to cure a wife of Shah Alam of an affliction of the ear, and was immediately appointed one of that official's physicians. † In 1678 Shah Alam was made a governor of the Deccan, and Manucci accompanied him there in his professional capacity ; but soon returned with him to northern India as Aurangzeb recalled the new governor, almost at once, in order to help him in the conquest of Jodhpur. In 1681 Aurangzeb left his capital, which he was destined never to see again. Realising that if the south was ever to be rescued from the Mahratta plague, he must lead his armies in person against the infidels, he mustered an immense host and set out upon that extraordinary series of campaigns in the Deccan and Southern India which ended only with his death in 1707.

“ Before Aurangzeb's first campaign, Manucci abandoned the service of Shah Alam, and, reaching Surat,

* Six or seven years at Lahore, then travelling to the Island of Salsette, settling there in repose, then suffering some losses in commercial speculation, his return to Delhi could not have been, taking the difficulties of travelling in those days into consideration, before 1680 or 1679.

† The Mughal rulers, princes and their wives in the 17th. century were attended by their trusted physicians of high rank, and never sought medical advice from any outsider, much less from a vagabond stranger. They were generally suspicious of being poisoned. I have already shown the inferior position he held under Hakim Mohammad Muqim, the prince's physician.

made his way by boat to Daman and Goa.

"For his excellent manipulation of these embassies Manucci was in 1684, created a knight of the Portuguese order of St. Jago.

"Manucci found a safe refuge at Madras which he reached in 1686." (*Oaten's Travels in India*, pages 215-219.)

My principal object in quoting the abstract of Manucci's life from *Oaten's Travels* is to show that he did not live at Aurangzeb's court at all; it was only for a few days that he attached himself in disguise to the victor's army. He reached Delhi, according to his own statement, when the struggle between Dara and Aurangzeb had just begun. He must have arrived there in the month of May 1658. In the month of July following, Manucci left Aurangzeb's army and joining the fugitive prince wandered with him in the Punjab and to Multan and Bhakhar. He then passed about twenty years in Lahore and distant parts of India, e.g. Bengal, Madras, Surat, Goa, Bombay, Bassein, Salsette Island and the Deccan, sometimes serving in Jai Singh's army or working in other capacities but never in Delhi or near it. Towards the end of 1680, or in the early part of 1681, he left Shah Alam's service never to return to Hindustan again. He passed 31 years, the greater and the last part of this period, (1680 to 1717) in Madras, where he died in 1717. There are hardly two years left during which he might have remained in Shah Alam's service under Hakim Mohammad Muqim.

As the princes lived in their distant provinces they came to Delhi on particular occasions only. For this reason when Manucci was in Shah Alam's service he could not have lived in Delhi more than a few weeks all told.

What can be considered of a man who, not living at the Mughal court at all, or living with a prince for a short time, finds fault with Bernier for being less informed owing to his too short stay at the Mughal court,—only eight years?

If Manucci's writings had not biassed very just and learned European historians of the Mughal emperors of India the book in itself was worth nothing and much below the notice of people who set even the slightest value on their time. I know for certain that Europeans cannot realise the sentiments that are raised, on its perusal, in the minds of common-sense Indians. There are thousands of fabulous stories current among the common and the lower classes of people in India which are told simply to amuse children or to lull idle people to sleep. Extraordinary events, and actions attributed to kings, queens, rajas, ranis, merchants, travellers and heroes, serve to tickle the imagination of children and other idle listeners. They are just like 'The Arabian Nights,' fairy tales and tales of derring-do which are found in children's story-books in Europe. Manucci having heard these tales from menial servants, or in the bazar, or elsewhere, thought of utilising them to deceive his compatriots to his own advantage. He

entered all these stories, with some modifications where necessary to suit his purpose, in the form of a history. He made the frame-work of his history out of the commonly known facts of the country and embellished it with an infinitely greater amount of the fabulous and mythical. A native of the country, being acquainted with these tales, will find out at the first sight of the book that it is a humbug. But Europeans not knowing the facts of the case would naturally consider it not only amusing but instructive. Besides this trick Manucci invents scandalous stories, particularly about respectable ladies and gentlemen, and describes, in the form of historical events and characters, things which no historian ever mentioned. Anachronism is common in his writings.



not afflict yourself dear husband,' replied Madam 'Simon, on that point, for, perceiving your hopeless condition, I have already made my alliance with M. Cornot our shoemaker. As soon as you depart to your blissful home I shall marry him to make it impossible for M. Sidan to press me on the subject. As to my maintaining my secret old friendship with him, I hope my future husband will follow your example in having no objection to whatever I choose to do.' 'Thank you, dear wife,' added the reverend gentleman, 'I shall now die happy.'

"Another amusing incident occurred some weeks previously. The reverend gentleman was preaching one day in a public hall to a great audience, and during his sermon he described hell as ever burning with fury, whose fire never quenches. After the sermon several coal-dealers hastened to see the preacher and begged him to secure them the job of supplying coal to hell-fire, and that in view of his trouble to secure this monopoly for them, they agreed to pay him ten per cent. of their net profits.

"These clergymen do not only minister to the spiritual needs of the people, but they are often appealed to for help in temporal concerns, and they promptly undertake the task, however difficult it may be, to gratify the applicants. I saw one day a young man, apparently belonging to some respectable family, come to see my reverend friend when I was alone with him. He told the clergyman, that several months before, he

had married a young and very amiable lady. But when he took her to a *bona vista* belonging to one of his friends to pass their honeymoon, he was greatly disappointed to find her too devout and religious to care for sensual or other worldly pleasures. He also said that he had tried his best to persuade her to yield to his wishes but he found her inflexible. She passed, he said, almost the whole of her time in reading devotional books or praying, and neglected, even abhorred, everything of this world. The Reverend Father asked him to leave his wife with him for some days that he might effect the cure of this mania. The proposal was accepted and the young lady after four weeks training was sent back to her home in as pleasure-loving state of mind as any woman of the world could be. Her husband went to the Father the following day, to express his gratitude for the great service he had done him.

"The French nation is the most advanced of all the civilised nations of to-day. They work hard to make discoveries and inventions in every department of science and art. When I was in Paris there lived the greatest physiologist of the time named Claude Bernard. He made many new experiments and discovered many biological phenomena which had thitherto remained unknown to all the world. A great number of fashionable ladies of Paris, conceiving some hope of getting rid of Eve's curse through the great physiologist's unparalleled genius, sent an application to him in the

following terms.

"All the fashionable ladies of Paris beg to draw the attention of the eminent physiologist towards an act of the greatest importance to humanity, an act which no one else has been able to perform, i.e. to liberate women from the ban of the hereditary curse of conceiving and bringing forth children in sorrow. If he would be good enough to have mercy upon the distressed nature of women and give them everlasting relief, he would lay them under everlasting obligation to him. They desired him to find out some means by which the Parisian women may be made to lay eggs like birds. They might hire other women to hatch their eggs, or incubators might help them in developing and bringing forth their young. They also agreed to pay the eminent physiologist most liberally for his pains, and recoup him any expenses which he might have to undergo in discovering this wonderful method.

"The physiologist, granting the strange request, had set about it when I left Paris, and I cannot say whether he finally succeeded in his efforts or not. You know, my friends, that I have always been extremely scrupulous in relating and writing what is perfectly true. I am not like Monsieur Renan or Voltaire who wrote many things which they could not verify or see with their own eyes, and often jumped to conclusions in their reasoning process. I abhor, I assure you, such unscientific methods and unscrupulous conduct.

"The method of dispensing justice, though very odd

to our eastern ideas, is as perfect in France as any human affair can possibly be. I often used to attend the courts of justice in Paris to learn the wisdom of their laws. A case was tried one day in my presence, and a very just judgment was passed by the wise and intelligent judge. If I had not heard the judgment issued by the judge, with my own ears, in perfect health, and with the deepest interest and attention, and in a most serene and tranquil state of mind leaving no possibility of mistake, I would never put it down in my memoirs for fear of leading my readers into error. One man sued another for kicking his wife in the belly when she was four months gone in the family way. The kick caused abortion. The criminal act being proved against the defendant, the wise judge, after meditating some minutes over the matter, pronounced the following sentence.

“As the crime of causing abortion by the rash though unintentional act of the defendant has been proved, I, judge of the Supreme Court of Justice, sentence the culprit to take the woman, upon whom the crime was perpetrated, to his house, to bear the expense of her clothing, feeding, lodging and all her other wants, till she reaches the same period of pregnancy at which the abortion was caused, then, and not till then, the said woman shall return safe and sound to her husband the plaintiff.

“All the people present in court unanimously praised the great wisdom of the judge.

"One day on returning to my lodgings my host informed me that I should be ready the next day to present myself before the Emperor Napoleon III, in the *Palais Royal*, and that a court-officer would conduct me to the royal presence at a certain hour. I could not talk French then but my interpreter always helped me and translated whatever was said to me, as he could not be permitted to accompany me to the *palais* I felt greatly embarrassed. My host however consoled me saying that the emperor desired to see all foreign visitors to Paris who appeared persons of distinction, and asked them a few questions and then dismissed them with great honour. So my host said he would teach me the proper answers to the royal enquiries, and thus my ignorance of French would not be detected. I thanked him most cordially for this service which was of vital importance to me. He then told me that the emperor would ask me first of what age I was, and that I must reply *Vingt-cinq ans* (25 years). He would next ask me how long I had been in Paris, to which I should reply *Deux mois* (2 months). He would ask finally if I found the French polite and the nation highly civilised, and I should say *L'un et l'autre exactement* (certainly, both).

"When I was presented to the emperor he, unfortunately, reversed the order of his questions on that day and asked me first how long I had been in Paris. According to my instructions I replied '*Vingt-cinq ans*' (25 years). His Majesty looked surprised at my reply

and asked me how old I was. I said '*Deux mois*' (2 months). He then looked somewhat angrily at me and said that either he was a fool or I was. I, taking it for the usual third question, replied '*L'un et l'autre exactement*' (certainly, both). The officer who conducted me to Court, understanding the reason of this extraordinary interlocution, most kindly intervened and explained the cause of the anomaly to the emperor whose rage and surprise were thus removed.

'The emperor appeared rather amused at my simplicity and ordered me to pay my respects to him once a week. I thanked his majesty for so honourable a reception and withdrew. According to his majesty's wish I went to pay my respects to him every week. Gaiety and merriment were the distinguishing features of the royal court of Paris. As I grew more familiar with the courtiers our conversation in the presence of the emperor was gradually becoming freer and less reserved. One day the emperor asked me why the Indians were of various colours and complexions, while all the French are of nearly the same colour. I replied that God distinguishes the species and classes of His creatures by different qualities, as horses have different colours, while donkeys are all similar. As the features of the Foreign Minister of France bore great resemblance to mine, the emperor asked me if my mother had ever visited Paris. I understood the insinuation and replied immediately that as far as I knew my father travelled in France years ago. The emperor

and the whole court admired my wit and shrewdness. At the next interview the emperor, wishing to outwit me, presented me with a picture of an ass, beautifully framed. I thanked him for the valuable present and I secretly *en un tour de main* changed the picture of the ass for the emperor's likeness which I had in my pocket. The prime minister unaware of the trick desired to see the present. I handed to him the framed picture which having looked at he raised his eyes, gazed at his majesty's face and exclaimed "what a perfect representation." Hearing this remark the emperor seemed to be annoyed, but on looking at the picture himself he confessed that I was superior in wit and wisdom to any man he ever knew.

"At the time I am writing about, the relations of France with the Sublime Porte were growing more complicated, and the emperor wished to send some consummate diplomat to Constantinople as French representative or ambassador. Finding me possessed of the highest talents he offered me the above-named office. I always liked freedom so I declined the honour on the ground of my inexperience of such important missions. The emperor appeared a little annoyed at my apparently haughty conduct. He told me, however, to think the matter over and report my decision after proper deliberation at the next interview. I then left the court and accompanied by my friend the court-officer, by whom I was presented to the emperor, drove through *Rue des Italiens*, and as we passed by the

Grand Opera I noticed a signboard with the words NOURRICERIE DE CHARITE inscribed upon it. I asked my friend what the words meant; and since our mutual friendship and confidence had greatly increased, he confided to me that it was an establishment for rearing natural children who had no responsible fathers, and as the mothers for reason of shame or poverty could not rear them, they left them in this house to be brought up by nurses attached to it. They were well cared for and well educated, and were provided by the government with situations in the public services, or such employment as accorded with their mental and natural inclinations. As these children are generally the issue of the strongest passion of love, they, as a rule, are most intelligent and clever. For this reason the offices of the imperial court and cabinet are exclusively held by these people.

"After driving about for an hour my friend asked the coachman to stop in front of a certain gate, where we got down. We entered a large building of six storeys containing about 300 apartments. All these were occupied by beautiful, young, healthy and strong women, with their babies in vigorous health, but no man was seen there. The ground-floor rooms were however occupied by the officers of the establishment. My friend introduced me to the head of the establishment who received me very politely and talked with me on different subjects for some time. It was then explained to me that the establishment was the prac-

tical result of the evolution theory. The best and healthiest unmarried women of the country were lodged in that building, and the best male specimens of health and vigour from any part of the world were procured, and thus the finest breed from their union was obtained, with the view of making the French people the fittest in the world, that they might remain the only survivors in the universal struggle for life. All measures of natural and sexual selection were provided for. I wondered at the wisdom of the people, and having seen the best specimens of the future generation of the French there, we took our leave of them to return home. On the way we picked up a British officer, one of my friend's acquaintances. This gentleman told me of a peculiar custom prevailing in some of the outlying districts and out-of-the-way places in the British Isles. In these places wages are very low, and few people can afford to marry and live comfortably, consequently, sometimes, two or more brothers will band together to marry one wife. This is considered quite in keeping with morality, and the offspring legitimate.

"Though I had declined the honour of the ambassadorship, the emperor did not like to deprive his ministry of my wise counsel when he had the chance of profiting by it. He consequently appointed me on the staff of M. Gramont who was then promoted to the rank of Foreign Minister, and was considered to be to France what Bismarck was to Germany.

"As the union of the German states in those days

had been firmly established, and a relative of the Prussian king was to succeed to the Spanish crown, the French nation was greatly alarmed. They at first tried, through their ambassador in Prussia, to get some compensation for France as a set-off against the increase of Germany's power. But Prince Bismarck opposed the proposal and would not consent to yield to France a single rod of German territory. In consequence of such complications the French government had to declare war against Germany and ordered the mobilisation of its forces for service at the front. Marshal Mac-Mahon was put at the head of the army, and my services being considered indispensable on this critical occasion, I was put on his staff as an advisory member. The total number of the effective forces of France was shown on the army-roll as 1,200,000, but it was soon found that the actual number of serviceable troops was considerably below 400,000. There was another difficulty which retarded mobilisation for many days. A sufficient number of transport wagons could not be got ready. The weapons issued from the arsenal were of many different patterns, and there were thousands of soldiers who had to be drilled in their use before they could be of any service in the field. Anyhow three army corps were first mobilised and the rest were to follow as soon as they were properly equipped. At this time the Parisians were so confident of easy victory that they had taken flags from their homes in order to plant them on the forts of Berlin.

On the 19th of July 1870 skirmishes between outposts and scouting parties began. Gradually larger bodies advancing and coming in sight of each other artillery duels began and cavalry charges were made. Sometimes the Germans lost ground but soon they retook their positions or took possession of some other fort or town. This warfare went on for many weeks without any decisive result. The Germans fought like devils. They did not observe any rules of good conduct in peace or war. Their breach of faith and outrageous behaviour incensed me exceedingly, and I assured Marshal Mac-Mahon that if they conducted themselves like that in India they would be severely punished. He then asked me what I thought would be the issue of the struggle. I said that as far as I could judge from our then situation, both parties would remain equally balanced in the end. We might lose the war but were sure to gain a good name for our noble behaviour, while the Germans might win the war but were sure to lose their reputation, particularly among people of culture, for their felonious conduct. They acted like robbers respecting neither the lives, feelings nor property of their rivals. They opposed 600,000 troops against our 300,000. This was quite an unscientific and barbarous way of fighting. They were sure to lose their honour and reputation with the civilised world. Of what avail was gaining the whole world if the soul was lost. The Marshal was greatly confused and almost heart-broken at the irresistible

1

onslaughts and stubborn resistance of the Prussians, but my speech calmed him and set his mind at rest. The fighting continued with varying fortune for some days more, till on the fatal day of September the 1st 1870, the Marshal lost 17000 men at Sedan and capitulated to the Prussians, who took 82000 prisoners. The Emperor seeing no hope of escape hoisted a white flag at 3 o'clock, and at 5 o'clock he sent the following letter to the king of Prussia by one of his aides-de-camp.

‘MONSIEUR MON FRERE,

‘Not being destined to die in the midst of my troops I can but deliver my sword into Your Majesty’s hands.’

To this the King replied :—

‘While I regret the circumstances under which we meet, I accept Your Majesty’s sword.’

“Seeing this horrible state of affairs I took to retreat and continued fleeing till I crossed the borders of France. If I had fallen into the hands of the Prussians they would have shown me little mercy. Marshal Von Moltke and Prince Bismarck knew very well that my counsel had inflicted such great losses to their army as not to be forgotten for many generations to come.

“These facts which I have described were witnessed by me but I do not know what occurred after I left the country.”

I was curious to know who the writer of these memoirs was, so, after great and long research, I found he was a man from Lahore belonging to the Rawal

class, who had been taken into service as a *khidmatgar* or domestic by a French traveller, and reached France in 1868. He, there being dismissed by his master, took to his class-profession of fortune-telling which almost all his people in this country follow. Having lived there for about three years he came back with his memoirs, the fruit of his travels, written in French. As he was himself illiterate he engaged the services of a French amanuensis, and made him formulate and write in good French what he told him in such broken and poor French as he had learnt to speak by that time.

I had great doubts about the genuineness of these memoirs, that is whether the Rawal had ever been to Europe, or the memoirs pure invention, till I found a living example whose still more extraordinary and successful feats of genius, chance, or whatever it may be termed, could not be doubted or denied.

About the year 1880, two Rawals in the Phagwara Tahsil of Kapurthala State, travelled in different parts of Europe and the colonies, earned an enormous amount of money in a short time, returned home very rich, purchased land, and built good houses in their country. I was well acquainted with one of them before he went on his foreign travels, and from his own lips, when he came back, I heard the account of his adventures.

This man was illiterate, with very dull intellect, rough and vulgar manners, and his long hair and beard were, unkempt and seldom washed. When he spoke

saliva flew from his mouth and sometimes dribbled down his beard which he wiped with the back of his hand. He practised couching in cataract cases and treated some other eye diseases as well as opérating on piles. By practising his medicine and surgery in Europe he earned much more than a lakh of rupees in a few years. The amount he sent home per postal money-orders was over a lakh, and what he finally brought with him and spent in his travels must have been several thousands more, because he always had to engage a European interpreter and took with him two or three companions and pupils belonging to his own family. I give here a short account of his adventures as he related them to me.

"Whenever I hired an apartment in any town of Europe, the fame of my skill spread far and wide so quickly, that in a few days the number of patients coming to me became so great that the whole street was blocked up by the crowd, and the police authorities had to interfere to keep order and make room for the carriage traffic which was quite obstructed. Many people tried to force their way through the impenetrable crowd with which I remained generally surrounded the whole day, wishing simply to 'touch the hem of my garment' in order to be cured. As my presence in every town caused a great falling off in the practice of the native doctors, they grew very jealous of me, and got orders issued by the local government for me to leave the town. For this reason I could not stay

long in any one place, and had consequently to wander from place to place staying only a few days at each town. But my fame gradually spread all over the country and, owing to the early precautions taken by the doctors, I was refused entrance to many towns. Notwithstanding such unfavourable circumstances my fees did not average less than five, sometimes ten or more, pounds a day. If I had been permitted to stay in each city as long as I wished, I could have easily earned three-thousand pounds a month. By the time I had shown a sufficient number of instances of my unparalleled skill to establish my reputation, I was compelled to depart, and from some towns much earlier. The number of my travelling days put together much exceeded those of my sojourning. Once I performed an operation on piles, and the patient through excessive bleeding unfortunately died. I had then to refund the fees that had been paid me. This single unfortunate event made me wiser, and in future whenever a patient applied to me for such an operation I took the precaution of securing an agreement from him and his relations not to ask for a refund of the fees in case of the patient's death. Many people asked permission to take my photo which I generally granted. One day I asked my interpreter why the people were so fond of taking my photo. He replied 'Because you are so beautiful.' I was astonished at his answer and said 'My countrymen do not think me so,' to which he replied 'It is a matter of taste.'

Hearing this story and seeing the proof of its truth (inasmuch as he became suddenly so rich through his obsolete and worthless method of practice in highly civilised western countries towards the end of the nineteenth century, in spite of professional doctors), had I not been acquainted with the highly advanced condition of the noble French nation, in whose country I have travelled, I might have thought the first Rawal's story true also. Indeed I might have been more easily deceived by its erroneous statements than Manucci's credulous readers are. Of these two Indian travellers' adventures, the latter are certainly facts, the former may be fiction because I could not verify them from any other source or evidence than his own statement. Manucci cannot excel the latter in good fortune, nor the former in genius, but he may have excelled both in telling lies maliciously, to which fact Mr. S. Lane-Poole also adds his testimony calling him 'the greatest calumniator of Aurangzeb,'* and in *Note on Authorities* in his *Aurangzeb* says "Catron's *Historic Generale de l'Empire du Mogol* (1715), founded on the Portuguese memoirs of M. Manouchi, would be invaluable if there were any means of authenticating it by comparison with Manucci's MS., as it is, the work is too full of errors, and savours too strongly of the *chronique scandaleuse* of some malicious and disappointed backstairs underling at the Mughal Court to be esteemed as an authority."

* Lane-Poole's *Aurangzeb*, p. 86.

If Catron's history is founded on Manucci's memoirs as stated, then the scandal-monger, the malicious and disappointed underling can be no other than Manucci.

Governor Pitt of Madras, being in India in Manucci's life-time, was certainly in a much better position than anyone else for judging the merits of his book, *Storia*, which he styles *The History of Tom Thumb*.*

—————*—————

* Oaten's Travels, p. 221.

CHAPTER III.

Some readers may object to what I have said for the reason that so many English historians, who are so learned and impartial, do not reject Manucci as totally worthless. I have already, in the first part of this essay, pointed out several unpardonable mistakes committed by historians of repute. When this is the fact the objection is unreasonable. Oaten in his book of *Travels*, page 216, and Col. Tod in his *Annals of Rajistan*, vol. ii, page 46, and some other historians also, speak of Dr. Bernier's being in Aurangzeb's retinue at the Battle of Samugarh; this is an error, for he arrived in India more than six months later (*Vide Chronicle of F. Bernier*, affixed to his *Travels*). It is quite inconceivable to me how such gross blunders can occur in the writings of well-informed people like Col. Tod and Mr. Oaten. They cannot be excused for their ignorance of Bernier's life, for he himself says that, near Ahmedabad, on his way to Delhi, he met Dara. (This was after his last battle).* If so many errors, easily detectable, characterise these books we cannot say how many more errors, not so easy to detect, they contain. Their authority for this reason, unless corro-

*Bernier's *Travels*, pages 89, 90 and 91; Tavernier's *Travels*, Vol. I, p. 349; *Chronicle of Bernier* affixed to his *Travels*, p. XX.

borated by other sources of information, is of no value. That great scientific people make such mistakes the following quotation shows, setting forth both their occurrence and reasons.

"We all are inclined to see what we expect or wish to see, and if we see what we expect or wish to see, we are naturally less incredulous and less critical than if we see what we did not expect or did not wish for. We are all liable to this, and we have all to learn to be doubly incredulous when we meet with unexpected confirmation of our own favourite theories. I shall give you two illustrations only of what I mean, cases where men, famous for their honesty and their critical disposition, were completely deceived in what they saw and heard.

One is the case of Darwin. We know how from his early youth his mind was dominated by the idea of evolution, and his researches led him to look everywhere for evidence in support of that theory and for an explanation of its working. He wished to find men as low as animals, or, if possible, even on a slightly lower stage than that reached by some of the higher animals. When he visited the coasts of South America he thought he had found in the inhabitants of Tierra del Fuego what he was looking for, and accordingly described these people as like the devils which come on the stage in such plays as the Freischutz. 'Viewing such men,' he writes, 'one can hardly believe that they are fellow-creatures, and inhabitants of the same world.'

Their language scarcely deserves to be called articulate. Captain Cook compared it to a man clearing his throat; but certainly no European ever cleared his throat with so many hoarse, guttural and clicking sounds.' With regard to the physical features of these Fuegians also Darwin must either have been unlucky in the specimens he met or he must even then have used his own somewhat coloured Darwinian spectacles. Captain Snow speaks of exactly the same race, which Darwin describes as hideous devils, as really beautiful representatives of the human race, and Professor Virchow who exhibited a number of natives from Tierra del Fuego at Berlin, protested warmly against the supposition that they were by nature an inferior race. But more than that, their very language which had been described by Captain Cook and by Darwin as worse than the noise of a man clearing his throat, has lately been studied by Gia-Como Bove, who describes it as 'sweet, pleasing, and full of vowels,' and who states that the number of words forming their dictionary amounts to 32,430. If we remember that Shakespeare could say all he wished to say—and who has poured out a greater wealth of thought and feeling than Shakespeare?—with about 15,000 words, a race possessed of more than double that number of words can hardly be said to be below the level reached by some of the higher animals." (F. Max Muller's *Natural Religion*, pages 82-3).

I need not quote here the second illustration alluded

to by Max Muller, this alone is sufficient to convince one that the savants, the honest and most intelligent people, can make gross mistakes. The instances of errors that I have mentioned and Professor Max Muller has mentioned and explained ought to be avoided, for by following plain rules of right observation they are avoidable. There is another kind of mistake which is neither easily avoidable nor so greatly blamable. It can be better expressed by the words *difference of opinion* rather than by the word mistake.

In delicate and complicated questions people of similar intelligence, sentiments and education frequently differ, but there are particular questions in regard to which entirely *opposite* views are held by people of different religions, nationalities, education and sentiments. One considers a thing right, the other considers it wrong ; or one considers it a matter of indifference, and another considers it a very grave matter. This sort of difference is not easy to remove. European Christians, for instance, all use wines freely owing to the peculiarity of their climate and the absence of any religious prohibition of the use of intoxicants. It is only their abuse, that is their excessive use, that is considered blameworthy. The Muslims, on the contrary, both from hygienic and religious points of view, regard the use of wines with horror. They class adultery, gambling and drinking in the same category of sins, considering the first, however, more abominable and punishable than the rest. Of course there are

unscrupulous, lukewarm, or indifferent people who violate, transgress and neglect the laws and duties of their religion for such are found in every nation and religion.

The institution of polygamy is looked upon by Christians with great horror, while Muslims generally consider it a matter of indifference.

Manucci says that the Head Qazi, Abdul Wahab, the religious head and leader of Muslims, drank a bottle of spirits daily. It is utterly impossible for a European to realise the gravity of this imputation, while a Muslim will take it very seriously, and will consider the calumniator most malignant and malicious, and a liar of the basest kind.

If anyone said of a certain Archbishop of Canterbury that he legalised polygamy and practised it secretly, no Christian would believe it, and would consider the slanderer most malign, while a Muslim could not participate in the feelings experienced by his Christian brother, caused by such a scandalous imputation.

As long as religious, national, racial and educational differences continue to guide and control human sentiments and actions the difference and antagonism of opinion can never be removed, therefore they ought to be tolerated and the parties concerned excused.

Aurangzeb's hatred of Dara on the basis of the latter's heresy, and his consequent destruction are considered by Muslims among the meritorious acts of the emperor, while the same event 'has' made him, 'to

European writers, an object of aversion and severe criticism, and they look upon him as a cruel and barbarous tyrant.

Whether bigotry and unjust partiality have guided the Muslims in judging this question, or religious rancour and national conceit determined the opinion of the other party, is of no avail to discuss, for it is certainly irremediable. But to conceal, ignore or distort facts is greatly to be deplored, whether it be done through carelessness or deliberately.

To say that Aurangzeb was a compound of good and evil is the same as saying Aurangzeb was a mortal. Every human being is composed of spirit and matter, or of light and darkness. Man becomes praiseworthy or blameworthy according and in proportion to the preponderance of good or evil in him.

Mr. S. Lane-Poole is certainly the best and most impartial historian of Aurangzeb. He is an eminent oriental scholar and historian. I have read his *Saladin*, *Moors in Spain*, *Turkey*, and some other works, and his high character for impartiality, profound knowledge and sound judgment are everywhere unmistakably visible in all his writing that I have seen, not excepting his *Aurangzeb*. But it is a natural law that there is no human being, however insignificant, whose actions good or bad are of no consequence. The effect of good or bad words and deeds, however trifling they may appear, does not end with the words and deeds themselves, but continues a living influence, affecting

humanity far and wide and into the future indefinitely. For this reason philosophers as well as inspired persons have insisted upon inculcating on all people in any condition of life the practice of virtue and avoidance of vice. It is Manucci's pernicious writings which have not only infected a great number of ordinary historians who treat of Indian affairs but have influenced directly or indirectly to some extent the opinion of such brilliant and eminent scholars as Mr. Lane-Poole, whom I highly esteem for his rare talents, profound knowledge and spirit of impartial criticism.

As for the correspondence between Prince Akbar and Aurangzeb published by Professor J. N. Sarkar in an article contributed by him to *The Modern Review*, January 1915, I beg to make the following comments upon it. Though I consider the writer a man of great abilities and learning, for he has written several books on Aurangzeb which show his great erudition, yet I cannot help thinking that the heading of the article "The Nemesis of Aurangzeb," and the quotation* with which it opens, display the tendency of the writer. This is not to be wondered at considering what has been instilled into students for generations past. Till quite

*"—But in these cases

We still have judgment here ; that we but teach
 Bloody instructions, which being taught return
 To plague th' inventor : this even-handed justice
 Commends th' ingredients of our poison'd chalice
 To our own lips."

(*Macbeth*).

recently a similar hostile tendency prevailed in Europe, for a like reason, towards Mohamedans and all things Mohamedan. But thanks to the spread of education, and greater facilities for getting at and knowing the truth, a better understanding and a more tolerant spirit has been brought about. The author of the article says:—

“The Emperor in anger transferred Akbar to Jodhpur (June 1678), where he fought languidly against the Rajputs for some time, but in the end formed an intrigue with them to depose the bigoted Aurangzeb and proclaim himself emperor.”

It is a fact that Akbar and the Rajputs made a confederacy to fight and depose the emperor, but the question is, Was Akbar an active and willing member of the confederacy, or was he reduced to such a helpless state that he could be forced and tempted by the Rajputs to depose his father and seize the crown himself? As far as I can judge from the statements of different historians the latter alternative was more than probable. I quote below from Col. Tod's *Annals* a passage on this subject. It is to be noted also that the book was written from Rajput traditions and records, so it expresses only the Rajput point of view.

“On their continued successes, the Rana and his allies meditated the project of dethroning the tyrant and setting up his son Akbar. The pernicious example of his father towards Shah Jahan was not lost upon Akbar, who favourably received the overtures, but he wanted:

the circumspection which characterised Aurangzeb whose penetration defeated his scheme when on the eve of execution." (*Annals and Antiquities of Rajistan*, Vol. I. p. 359).

It is clear here that the projectors of Aurangzeb's desposal and setting his son Akbar on the throne were the Rana and his allies, not the prince himself. He was made to yield to their overtures. I do not mean to say that Akbar's intention of seizing the throne would have been a new idea among Mughal princes, on the contrary, it was a time-honoured Mughal tradition which ran through the whole dynasty. Jahangir revolted against his father, and Shahjahan against Jahangir, while the princes Shuja and Murad Baksh assumed royalty during the lifetime of their father, when Dara was made regent and king *de facto*. It was Aurangzeb only who remained a most dutiful and obedient son, till he was convinced that his father, owing to illness or old age, had actually abdicated the throne in favour of the heretic Dara, whose assumption of power had already created great disorder throughout the empire. Aurangzeb then thought it high time to assert himself. He did not dethrone his father but his heretic brother, Dara. As long as his old, decrepit father lived he continued to respect and serve him. Aurangzeb knew the Mughal instinct of his sons, therefore he punished his eldest son severely to deter the others from following their instinct. He punished his second son also on a slight suspicion of disobedience. This was enough to

intimidate the princes, his sons, and deter them from evincing the slightest semblance of neglect of duty.

The first letter* quoted in this article, from Aurangzeb to his son Akbar, is not genuine. There are two internal evidences of its spuriousness. "As the universal Father has planted in all fathers' bosoms affection for their sons." Christians at first used the word *father* for God metaphorically and they were perfectly right; but gradually some Christian sects in particular, and most Christians in general, used the word in its literal meaning in connection with the paternity of Christ. This, by the teaching of both the Quran and the Prophet Muhammad is great heresy and profanation. For this reason no Muslim ever thought or thinks of applying the word father to God. Aurangzeb being an earnest, zealous, orthodox Muslim could therefore never use the phrase quoted above. Besides this the diction and style of this letter do not correspond with those authenticated letters of Aurangzeb which we possess. These two internal evidences are conclusive for proving its spuriousness, or at least doubting its genuineness.

The second letter† written in a mocking tone and taunting style may be genuine in this sense, that it was penned by some Rajput secretary on the part of Prince Akbar, but against his will, savouring as it does so much of mockery and frivolity. Prof. Sarkar admits

* For letter, see Appendix.

† For letter see Appendix.

that it was inspired.*

The third letter from Aurangzeb to Prince Akbar may be genuine, but, as far as I can judge, its tenor does not correspond with that of his authenticated letters.

The fact of these letters being contained in some Persian manuscripts of the Royal Asiatic Society does not guarantee their genuineness. It has been a universal rule that when a thing is in great demand, respected or much sought after, its imitations are produced by unscrupulously ambitious and avaricious people to gain name, respect or money. After prophets impostors arise; when a medicine, instrument, machine or any other article of usefulness has gained a good reputation, its imitations are sure to follow, and are foisted upon the public as the genuine article. Aurangzeb wrote many letters with his own hand, and he was considered a master of the best Persian style. His letters were greatly esteemed, therefore they were collected and published in book form. As the demand and search after his letters continued for a long time after him, many people fabricated letters, imitating his

* Prof. Sarkar in a note says "The spirited defence of the Rajput character for fidelity and of Jaswant's memory shows that this letter was inspired by Durgadas."

He also admits, in a way, that the genuineness of these two letters is doubtful, for he says "The first two letters also occur, with many variants, in the A.S.B. MS. F. 56, etc." Now, there should be no variants about *true* copies. Which, therefore, if any, are true copies?

style as far as they could and plagiarising the phrases and expressions he generally used, and then sold these counterfeit letters to those who desired to possess genuine originals. Thus thousands of spurious letters came into existence.*

The motto of the Mughal princes, sons of the emperors, was 'A crown or else a glorious tomb,' 'A sceptre or an earthy sepulchre,'—'*Takht ya tabut*'—so I do not say that Aurangzeb's sons were an exception to this rule. After Aurangzeb's death they showed that they were true Mughal princes. All fought for the throne and each tried to reach the throne through his brothers' blood. Aurangzeb was not the originator of this custom, but some natural causes had gradually established this custom so deeply in this dynasty that at every demise of the crown the rival princes entered the arena of war to try conclusions with their rivals, and passing through the ordeal of battle-strife only the fittest survived, who then incontestably deserved and took possession of the crown.

'Might constitutes right' has been a natural and universal rule in all ages and all places throughout the animal kingdom, including the human race of course. Moral philosophers and religious leaders may protest against or deprecate the reign of *might* as much as they like, but it has been ever holding its own. Why have the European powers, who are certainly the most

* For further information see Appendix (b).

civilised in the world, for years been so very particular about preserving the 'balance of power'? When two states dispute on any question and cannot settle it amicably, they have no other resource than appealing to the arbiter of power. As long as people need a government to keep peace and order it will be power only that will have the right of governing them. International laws, diplomacy, engagements and treaties between foreign nations, advancement in science, art, and wealth, all have been tried and employed to check power from interfering in or intruding upon the social affairs or private concerns of the people, but when power comes into play all the other means intended to counteract it become most willingly subservient to it, and all conspire to support it. Power never wants any other pretext or reason than its own existence which is the greatest reason of its right; but in case a show of reason is required, every kind of reason is found at its command. The progress of human society has not made the slightest improvement in suppressing power, it has even been growing in authority *pari passu* with the progress of human society. Offensive and defensive weapons, the instruments of power, have been growing with equal pace with other inventions and discoveries. The present (1916) "Great War" is a living testimony of what I have been advancing. Human progress consists in modifying the forms and appearances, not in changing the nature, of things, and in using power under different cloaks or marks, not in

suppressing it.

In past ages power used to play its part in a comparatively naked form. Among the Indian Mughals he who had power to secure the throne did so; he had no need to produce any other reason for his attempt except royal blood and power. When Aurangzeb prosecuted Dara he contended that he was a heretic and incapable of governing the empire. But such a pretext for seizing a throne was not needed according to Mughal tradition and practice. This fact clearly proves that Aurangzeb was sincere in his words and acts, and his subsequent life sufficiently proves the same fact.

Aurangzeb's nobles, after living for several generations in the relaxing climate of India and Indian society with its effeminating influence, had degenerated and become effete. They were a squabbling mob jostling one another for the luxury and pleasures of high positions in the government. Aurangzeb was surrounded by those people. These nobles, in fits of passion and jealousy, sometimes gave bad names to one another like the low-born and mean. But I do not know if Aurangzeb ever replaced these nobles by actually low-born people, which charge has been laid at his door by some foreign historians, who perhaps took their cue from the well-known acts of certain European sovereigns. The enormous strain upon the system caused by the unavoidable Deccan wars was a fact which could not be helped. It is the result of all wars on all systems of government, and notably of the present Great war

in spite of advanced systems.

The regicides of Charles I, of England and Louis XVI, of France, and the authors of the most horrible, tragical end of Mary, Queen of Scots, are not looked upon with the same amount of repugnance and contempt, as Aurangzeb the fratricide, which appellation ought not to be applied to him, for he put neither his brother Dara nor Murad Bakhsh to death; they were sentenced by the ordinary courts of law as explained elsewhere. The motive for the commission of these cruel deeds was alleged to be the same or similar in all these cases, but the actions of the regicidal parties were unprecedented, while the fratricidal action of Aurangzeb was quite in accordance with Mughal traditions. The duty of being loyal and obedient to one's king is universally admitted to be more binding on a citizen than one's duties towards father and brothers. This is another illustration of the fact which I have already advanced, that the same ideas affect differently the minds of different people, sometimes quite oppositely. From an Asiatic point of view the murder of a king or a saintly queen is infinitely more horrible and unnatural than the murder of a brother if actuated and prompted by similar motives,—the latter can even be justified under particular circumstances. From the European point of view I find, in the case of Aurangzeb at least, that fratricide is a much more heinous and abominable crime than regicide.

A turncoat and deserter from among mercenary

soldiers is considered as ignoble and criminal as one from among the national, voluntary, or conscriptional soldiery. The crime is breach of faith and engagement, because the soldier has sold his services for a price; but the mere fact of being a mercenary is not a crime. When, however, one of the two fighting parties is defeated the engagement of the mercenary soldier comes to an end, and he is then free again to choose whichever side he pleases. He has only one tie—that of engagement—which he is bound to fulfil. A citizen of the same State, serving in the regular army against foreign foes, has a two-fold tie—an engagement like the mercenary soldier, and a patriotic duty, the welfare of his country. If a soldier of the latter class deserts or changes side he is doubly criminal. But after the complete defeat of a party it reasonably surrenders to the victorious party. This is not considered ignoble or criminal, nor was it in any age usually so considered. In the wars of civilised nations of to-day hundreds and thousands of officers and privates fall into their enemy's hands as prisoners, and even (under compulsion, it is true) work to help them. If these soldiers had continued to fight as long as their ammunition lasted and then used their swords, bayonets or butt-ends of rifles, they could not have fallen alive or uninjured into the enemy's hands. Still these prisoners are not held blamable because they laid down their arms when they found resistance fruitless. After a defeat or surrender only the most barbarous and cruel

victor would think of inflicting any punishment upon the vanquished foe.

The battles of the Indian Mughal princes in their wars of succession were neither for the freedom of the nation from the oppression or tyranny of a foreign yoke, nor to support and save their religion. The soldiers had no motive for fighting on the side of either sovereign or pretender beyond that of fulfilling their engagement of service-for-money.

When Dara's army was dispersed and fled, and Dara himself took to flight, the victory was complete. Aurangzeb ordered his army not to pursue them. From that moment hundreds of Dara's officers and men began to lay down their arms before Aurangzeb and were received favourably without a moment's hesitation.

It is a general rule, in military operations, that when an enemy retreats the other pursues him till he either surrenders or gets beyond the pursuer's reach. But Aurangzeb, at the very commencement of the retreat in confusion of Dara and his army, became sure of victory and immediately issued orders not to pursue them. If Manucci still persisted in following Dara he could have safely done so; but attaching himself to Aurangzeb's army in disguise is quite inconceivable, and a contradiction in terms. He saw that every man of Dara's party, without a single exception, was favourably received by Aurangzeb if he chose to go over to him. In this case Manucci's statement, that he went over to Aurangzeb in disguise, leads me to think that

Manucci was not present at the Battle of Samugarh, but hearing the story of this campaign from others put it in his book pretending that he was an eye-witness of these events. This induction is as legitimate and logical as any other can be.

As Manucci fought on his master's side to the end he could not have been considered a turncoat or a deserter if he had gone over to Aurangzeb; on the contrary, he would have been looked upon as very faithful and loyal servant who did not desert his master as long as that master fought. Besides this, mercenaries are not always contemptible as the following passage shows.

"The body of Greeks, immortalised under the name of *The Ten-thousand* though embarking on a foreign mercenary service, were by no means outcasts or even men of extreme poverty." (*Grote's History of Greece*, Vol. IX. p. 11.)

All public and private servants all over the world have always been and are mercenaries, i.e. they work for wages; but mercenary soldiers deserve more esteem and compassion as they risk their lives more than any other class of servants, while keeping faith and engagement is the supreme of all duties.

Dr. Bernier and J. B. Tavernier, two European travellers in the reigns of Shahjahan and Aurangzeb, have written their memoirs of India in great detail, the former describing the Wars of Succession and other events as fully as he could; but neither of them names Manucci at all. Mr. W. Irvine therefore remarks very

justly: "This fact clearly shows that Manucci was some very insignificant man not to be noticed by any European traveller." But Manucci claims to have been for years captain of artillery, first in Prince Dara's service and afterwards in Raja Jai Singh's army. Such boastful pretensions in the absence of any other evidence than his own statement is a sufficient proof of their falsehood, because "Evidence is and must be the test of truth, and is, I suppose, the ultimate ground on which we believe anything."

The external evidence of Dr. Legrenzi that Manucci was illiterate, and Governor Pitt's remark that *Storia* was "The History of Tom Thumb," and the internal evidence of the whole of *Storia*, prove very clearly the author's worthlessness and the fictitious character of his book.

Manucci does not deserve the epithet of 'quack' as he practised bleeding, cupping, cauterising, etc. as barbers and Rawals have been always doing in this country. He knew his business and was right in practising it. Also those gentlemen whose commanding aspect and confidence-inspiring manners lead the country-people to entrust them with their wants and pains in the hope of receiving help from them, and those who from charitable dispositions distribute to the needy such harmless but well-known, beneficial drugs as quinine and cascara, cannot be called quacks. According to the real sense of the word only those persons, who practise and pretend to know what they do not know, ought to be

called quacks. The greatest number of quacks is among the professional doctors who, not knowing the nature, actiology and treatment of most internal diseases, pretend to know and to cure them. Those doctors who pretend to understand and to cure plague are really great quacks, because their profession and position enable them to impose upon the public and do greater harm than common quacks. My remarks about Manucci on this point were elicited by Oaten's description of him as 'blossoming forth as a quack doctor,' otherwise I would not foist even this unenviable dignity upon him.

The modern tendency of whitewashing every one in the past seems to me based upon a just and reasonable ground. It requires a little explanation. The essential factors that contribute to form human character, that leads man to a particular line of conduct, are four—heredity, temperament, environment, and education. Heredity has the greatest share in forming specific, racial and family characters, both physical and mental. Temperament plays the greatest part in the emotional sphere, and environment in forming general character. Education has the greatest influence in forming and modifying the character and conduct if properly applied. But it requires very patient observation, deep penetration, and very sound judgment on the part of the teacher and governor to adopt particular methods suited to the particular cast of brains and minds of their charges. It is a peculiarity of the human mind that ideas and

conceptions, impressed upon it by teaching and education, modify its character and conduct. Sometimes the other three factors predominate to such a degree as to counteract every kind of education and baffle it altogether.

The natural laws, the necessary relation of cause and effect have been admitted on all hands to be unchangeable. Even those religious people, who believe in miracles and supernatural occurrences, have been compelled to admit some special natural law to explain their possibility.

In the phenomenal world the antecedents invariably determine the particular consequents. Human character, conduct and action cannot be exceptions to this universal law of nature. If the mind can control human actions in spite of antecedents then it exercises supernatural power. But nothing supernatural is possible, and it is most absurd to think that every human being has supernatural power. Therefore all human actions are also determined by antecedent phenomena. In this case the human mind has no option or choice of its own actions. For this clear reason no one can be reasonably held responsible for his actions. It is true that, to superficial observers, this opinion or doctrine may seem to destroy the whole of the moral superstructure and to bring down human nature to the level of that of other animals. But I have already premised that education is one and the greatest of the four factors that form human character and conduct. Teaching,

training, inducing, persuading, warning, threatening, blaming, praising, rewarding, punishing, etc., are all within the category of education. Education is as essential to man's specific nature as food and air are to his life. The human being, from its birth onward, continues learning and progressing. This condition, which is peculiar to the human species, is called *freedom of will and responsibility*. By educational means, human character and conduct are certainly changed, hence the necessity of religion, social laws and politics.

The circumstances and conditions of every age and every country determine a particular line of human conduct such as is practicable and suitable for the good of human society under those particular circumstances. It is then by common consent considered good and right. Deviations from this general rule in abnormal cases occur which are prejudicial to human welfare, and therefore generally considered crime, sin, or vice, punishable by political laws or by the general censure, hatred and contempt of the other members of society.

When we write a history of any age and of any country, we ought to mention simply what we know about them, not to censure anything that is the product of the age and circumstances, and therefore certainly suitable for human good under those particular circumstances; but what we find abnormal and injurious to human society, and therefore out of the common way of that age, may well be criticised adversely as the people of that particular age would also have criticised

it. But it is very unjust to compare the conduct of the past ages with the standard of morals and politics of the present age, and condemn all who failed to conform to the conditions of our time. Necessity justifies everything; and we cannot realise the sentiments of those who have been labouring under conditions different from those of ours. Our guide to right conclusions in such cases is only general approval or disapproval of the people and age we are writing about. These are the reasons which justify us in whitewashing every-one in the past, excepting those who acted contrary to the rules of good conduct of their age.

In the present age the different nations cannot be brought to the same level of civilisation, nor to obey similar laws of society and politics. European nations, for instance, cannot bear absolute monarchy, while Asiatic countries, with the exception of Japan, cannot form and live under constitutional government. If any nation, like China or Persia, tries to abolish monarchy and establish constitutional government and succeeds in its object, it will certainly soon turn into aristocracy or absolutism under the mark of constitution; and even that may not last long unless some miraculous influence changes the nature of the people,—an event not probable in the near future unfortunately.

The condition of India in this respect is much more deplorable than any other Asiatic country. Its population is composed of incongruous elements as regards race, nationality, religion and language. These jarring

elements would fly to atoms if left to themselves for ever so short a time. But Providence through infinite wisdom and mercy has placed them under a wise, most benevolent, and powerful government to hold them in harmony and peace. Some of our short-sighted brethren, aspiring to acquire self-government like other advanced peoples, are trying their best to succeed in their object but invariably fail. Nature does not grant whatever one asks for, but it grants what one is fit for though not asked. We ought to be thankful to our kind and wise government who has not only permitted us to make progress but actively helps us to do so. If we are not able to govern ourselves we ought not to be blamed for that, because peculiar conditions have incapacitated us from doing so; but if we do not try to improve ourselves in this respect then we are certainly blamable.

The same British nation governs many nations by means of different administrative and political laws, according to the peculiarities of each nation. This is the clearest proof of what I have been maintaining, that all ages and all nations ought not to be judged by the same standard of right and wrong.

Before taking my final leave of Signor Manucci I beg to advance a theory to account for the extraordinary fact that *Storia* was written in three languages. The theory seems probable and reasonable.

Manucci first tried to write his book in his own language, Italian, and wrote a part of it so, but found it

too difficult a task, being uneducated, to formulate, as a book of historical facts, his fabricated stories and 'old wives' tales.' To remove this difficulty he employed an amanuensis who was French. This Frenchman wrote a portion of the book and had then to give up the work. The next man he could get was a Portuguese. In this way his polyglot book was written and completed. Mr. Oaten also seems to suggest the same idea when he says: "Written in three languages—Italian, Portuguese and French—a circumstance due to the author's difficulties with amanuenses.



CHAPTER IV.

Conclusion

I beg now to bring to the notice of my readers that what I said in the preceding pages was in vindication of a high and exemplary character which was much aspersed, defamed and maligned through the wantonness and malice of some early writers, and through the ignorance or credulity of many later ones. I also readily acknowledge that I am in a great measure indebted to their labours, which, in many instances, supplied me with the means of refuting what I cannot but consider their errors. From the careful and judicious study of Aurangzeb's histories written during his reign and after him by authors of note, who had access to accurate data or could acquire their knowledge from eye-witnesses of many events connected with him, a great amount of truth can be gleaned. But I have discovered two other sources whose genuineness, for the most part, is unquestionable, and these are capable of throwing a greater flood of light on the subject than all the histories and biographies of Aurangzeb put together. No historian, as far as I know, has ever used these sources for their conclusions concerning Aurangzeb's life.

The first and most important of these sources are the letters which Aurangzeb sent to his sons, governors

of provinces and other nobles. These he sometimes dictated to his secretaries, but more frequently wrote with his own hand. They generally conveyed to the addressees the emperor's orders and counsel about matters of administration, at times reproaching or praising some one's good or bad conduct. Some of these letters contained religious and moral precepts. Their style and diction were what may be called for their excellence the 'King's style and diction.' They were concise but clear; precise and forcible in style. Aurangzeb's letters were the mainspring of the machinery of his government. They were not intended to provide materials for writing his life or teaching the art of letter-writing. They were true and exact representations of his thoughts and feelings concerning his moral, social and political conduct, embodied in the form of words. Here lies the whole secret of his life in a nutshell. This fact is known to all his historians. These letters have been so eagerly sought after as relics or monuments of great historical moment, by both Indians and foreigners, that not only are they found in the public and private libraries of India, but in those of London, Paris and Berlin, and perhaps in other continental libraries as well.

But here is an instance of a strange inconsistency of thought and action. These very eager collectors of Aurangzeb's letters, when writing the history of his reign, never use them as great and sure data for their subject, but prefer the writings of Manucci and Bernier.

Prof. J. N. Sarkar, being well acquainted with these letters and possessing a great number of them seldom uses any of them in his *History of Aurangzeb*. It is still more strange to see this highly talented author sometimes basing his criticism of Aurangzeb upon letters forged, spurious, or of questioned authority, as I have pointed out in the last chapter. Possessing so many of Aurangzeb's genuine letters and never referring to them in his valuable work on the emperor, but, when criticising him adversely, making use of letters certainly spurious is a very significant fact.

Those who have studied Aurangzeb's letters and life from original reliable sources, can fairly distinguish the genuine letters from the spurious ones by their style, diction and tenor.

I certainly respect this author for his high talents, great erudition and indefatigable search for materials connected with the history of the greatest and best of the Muslim emperors of India.

Of Aurangzeb's letters he can, to a great extent, discriminate, if he wills, between what are and what are not genuine, because he is a great scholar. We ought not to be, however, without sympathy for persons eminent in any department of intellectual activity, even when, in their weakness, they are borne away by the current of general opinion.

The second great source of information regarding Aurangzeb's conduct and character are his firmans granting rent-free estates to Hindus and Sikhs for the

maintenance of their religious institutions, sacred places, and spiritual leaders.

During the course of the last few years I have heard of quite a number of such grants awarded by Aurangzeb; but I have never heard any other emperor's name mentioned in connection with such gifts. I could not understand this seeming inconsistency of Aurangzeb's conduct. He was deemed very stingy and a bigot. My limited knowledge of facts was not sufficient to draw general conclusions about the matter. I then inquired about these gifts from a Hindu friend of mine, who has been serving in the Government Settlement Department for over twenty-five years,—from Head-clerk to Deputy and General Superintendent. He was certainly in a better position than most people for knowing about and verifying the documents conferring these grants or gifts. He replied that he never kept records of such gifts, but as far as he remembered the greater number of the firmans in possession of grant-holders were issued by Aurangzeb. My informant has served in many districts of the Punjab and the United Provinces, so his testimony on such matters must be trustworthy.

Having thus ascertained this fact I reflected that as there had been many Muslim sovereigns before and several after Aurangzeb, there must be some cause for the number of his land-grant firmans exceeding those of all the other Muslim rulers put together. After deliberating well upon the subject I came to the con-

clusion that Aurangzeb was the most generous and impartial benefactor of his subjects without distinction of race or creed. No other explanation can be offered for the curious fact referred to above.

Though time has obliterated many monuments of Aurangzeb's greatness and goodness—schools, colleges, libraries, serais, roads, etc.—yet many of his letters and deeds-of-gift are still extant, and are living witnesses to his unsectarian generosity and benevolence,—monuments to his imperishable greatness.

If the truths contained in these two sources of information about Aurangzeb could be put into one scale of a balance, and the truths contained in all the histories and other books about him into the other scale, the former would far outweigh the latter.

Innumerable charges of the worst kind have been laid at Aurangzeb's door; but in trustworthy histories there are only three of them mentioned which seem to have some foundation of fact,—(1) wading through his brothers' blood to the throne, (2) ordering the destruction of some Hindu temples and the breaking of their idols, (3) the execution of Sambhaji in a cruel or barbarous way.

I have already explained some circumstances which brought about these deeds, and which justified them.

In destroying temples and idols Aurangzeb acted upon a simple rule of Islam, *returning like for like*, the same as that of the Mosaic Law, 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.'

Some Hindu teachers had the audacity to teach Muslim boys their heretical sciences, in order to make them apostates like Dara. They had thus hurt the Muslims' feelings and religious susceptibilities. In retaliation Aurangzeb destroyed their temples and idols to hurt the religious susceptibilities of the offenders.

It is true that in these days such acts would justly bring on rulers censure of the most serious kind; but when we consider the state of morality and general thought of those ages, and the unscrupulous and barbarous character of the people that were dealt with, we are forced to admit that the circumstances perfectly justified him in doing what he did.

If we compare Aurangzeb and his rule with his contemporary sovereigns and their methods of ruling, we are irresistibly forced to admit that he was an angel, and his reign the golden age.

How barbarously heretics were tortured in other countries, under Christian rulers, in those days,—their joints were dislocated, they were burnt in slow-fires, put to the rack or tortured by some other devilish device. Hundreds of thousands of the Protestants of France were forced to leave their homes and migrate to foreign countries, and their churches were demolished. The unspeakable horrors of the 'Inquisition' are too well known to need description. Were such cruelties practised under Aurangzeb? No! a thousand times no!

And as his rule surpassed that of any of his con-

temporaries in moderation and benignity, so in like-manner did his personal character excel theirs.

The basis of morality is not by any means fixed, if we are to judge by the records of human conduct set forth in history. Notions of good and evil have never shown themselves unalterable.

"They change with race, they shift with space,
And in the veriest span of time,
Each vice has worn a virtue's crown,
Each good been banned as sin or crime."

M. Cooper Willis.

APPENDIX.

(A).

Letter (*in extenso*) from Aurangzeb to his son, Muhammad Akbar.

" Muhammad Akbār, my son ! close to my heart, a piece of my liver [as it were], dear as my life,—be assured of and exalted with my sincere kindness, and know :—

God be my witness that I held you dearer and more beloved than all my other sons. But you through your own ill luck, were tempted by the deception and stratagem of the Rajputs, those Satans in a human shape, to lose your portion of the wealth of Paradise and to become a wanderer in the hill and wilderness of Misfortune. What remedy can I contrive and what help can I give? My heart became plunged in extreme sorrow and grief when I heard of your present miserable condition of anxiety, perplexity, ruin and wretchedness. Nay more, life itself tasted bitter to me ; what need I say of other things? Alas ! a thousand times alas ! leaving out of sight your [legitimate] pride of rank and majesty as a prince and Emperor's son, you, in your simplicity took no pity on your own [extreme] youth ; you showed no regard for your wives and children, but in the most wretched condition threw [them] into the captivity of those beast-looking beast-hearted wicked Rajputs ! And you are roaming in all directions like a polo ball, now rising, now fleeing !

As the Universal Father has planted in all fathers' bosoms affection for their sons, I do not, in spite of the heavy sins you have committed against me, wish that you should meet with the due punishment of your deeds:— (Verses). Even though the son may be a heap of ashes,

His father and mother regard him as collyrium for their eyes!

Let what is past be past! Now if you are so guided by Fortune as to repent of your improper deeds, you may wait on me at any place that you like; the pen of forgiveness will be drawn across the pages of your book of errors and offences; and such favours and graces will be shown to you as you have not conceived in your mind; and all your troubles and hardships will be compensated for. Although the granting of my favours does not depend upon your presenting yourself before me, yet as the cup of your disgrace has fallen down from above, it is proper that you should come to my presence even once, to remove the shame of evil repute from yourself. Jaswant, the chief of the Rajputs, assisted and accompanied Dara Shukoh, [but that prince] met with nothing save humiliation and reverse in consequence. Know for certain [that the same will be your fate too.]* Providence befriend you! God make it your lot to follow the right path."

* It is hardly likely that Aurangzeb, with his well-known faculty of penetration, would have resorted to so flimsy an argument to convince Akbar of the error of his ways. The reader should turn to Akbar's comment on this portion of the letter, in his reply. (See Appendix). . .

The reply to the above (in extenso).

From Muhammad Akbar to the Emperor Aurangzeb,
“The petition of the humblest of sons, Muhammad Akbar, who performs all the necessary ceremonies of adoration and devotion, submission and obedience, and like an atom lays the following before your majesty,—the centre of adoration and holiest shrine of this world and the next:—

The royal letter which, in a spirit of graciousness to slaves, had been addressed to this the humblest of sons, arrived at the happiest of times and the best of places. I laid this auspicious celestial disc on the crown of my head, and rubbed its white portion into my eyes like light and its black portion like collyrium, and illuminated my heart and eyes by reading its gracious contents. I submit a short commentary in reply to all the matters which have flowed from your pen, so full of advice and graciousness,—which [commentary], as Truth is the essence of a matter, will not be far [from appropriate] in proportion as it approaches Justice. Your Majesty has written with your gem-scattering pen, ‘I have loved this son above all my other sons, but he through his own ill luck has lost his share of [my] great wealth and thrown himself into the tempest of thoughtlessness.’ Hail Lord of the inner and outer worlds! Just as it is the duty of a son to seek the satisfaction of his father and devote himself to his father’s service, so, too, it is an obligation and duty on the part of the father to bring up all his sons

and attend to their interests, material and moral, and their rights. God be praised, that I have not hitherto failed in any way in rendering all the devotion of a son. How can I narrate in detail all the favours and graces of your Majesty,—of which I cannot write of even one in a thousand or of a few out of many? The care and protection of the younger son is everywhere and always the paramount aim of [all] great fathers. But your Majesty, contrary to the practice of the world, has shown small regard for all your younger sons and honoured your eldest son with the title of *Shah* [Alam], and appointed him as your heir. In what [code] of justice and equity can we enter this act? All sons have equal claims to the property of their father. Under what rule of the Holy Law and Faith can one [son] be exalted and the others thrown down? Although the True Emperor is another being, in whose administration 'when' and 'why' have no jurisdiction, and the raising or overthrowing [of kings] belongs to Him of luminous splendour,—yet, [how does such partiality consist with] your Majesty's devotion to the Canon Law, love of the righteous path, spiritual insight, and regard for truth, which are known and manifest to the world and its inmates, [as is proved by Shah Jahan's verses on your Majesty in youth]:

Whom will he wish for as a friend,

And to whom will his heart incline?

Verily, the guide and teacher of this path [of rebellion against a reigning father] is your Majesty; others are

merely following your footsteps. How can the path which your Majesty himself chose to follow be called 'the path of ill luck?'

(Verses). My father bartered away the garden of
Eden for two grains of wheat;
I shall be an unworthy son if I do not sell
it for a grain of barley!

Hail, Centre of the worlds, spiritual and temporal! Men draw hardship and labour on themselves. Former emperors like Akbar, Jahangir and Shah Jahan [deliberately] raised troubles, and in the end attained to their hearts' desires. The volumes of history prove that so long as a king [like Alexander the Great] does not penetrate to the wilderness of gloom (*sulmat*) he cannot taste the water of eternal life. No rose without a thorn, and no buried treasure without [its guardian] snake.

(Verses). That man alone can tightly clasp the bride
of Fortune in his arms,
Who can plant kisses on the lip of the keen-
edged sword.

As ease has been ordained as the result of every fatigue, I firmly hope that, through the grace of the Doer of All Works,—the Cherisher of His slaves,—my hearts' desire will soon manifest itself in the happiest manner, and all my anxieties and exertions will be converted into rejoicing.

Your Majesty has written, 'Jaswant was the chief of the Rajputs; what sort of assistance and support he rendered to Dara Shukoh is known to the world.'

Hence the words of this false race do not deserve trust.' Your Majesty has spoken very well indeed, but has not reached the marrow of the matter. In truth Dara Shukoh bore hatred and antipathy to this race, and what he suffered was the consequence of it. If he had agreed with them from the outset, his affairs would never have come to such a pass. Former emperors like Akbar had contracted alliance and kinship with this race and conquered the realm of Hindustan with *their* help. This is the race with whose aid and support Mahatab Khan made the Emperor Jahangir his captive and meted out due punishment on the tricksters and deceivers. This is the race who, when your Majesty was adorning the throne at Delhi and the Rajputs [there] did not number more than 300 men, performed heroic deeds, whose narrative is manifest to the age; such heroism and victory [were theirs] as the commanders of the age have not heard of. Jaswant it was who in the midst of the battle with Shuja displayed insolence and violence to your Majesty which were unworthy of pardon; and yet your Majesty knowingly and deliberately overlooked his act. The same Jaswant it was whom your Majesty won over with many charms and soft speeches and detached from the side of Dara Shukoh, so, that the victory fell to your side. Blessings be on this race's fidelity to salt, who, without hesitation in giving up their lives for their master's sons, have done such deeds of heroism that for three years the Emperor of India,

his mighty sons, famous ministers and high grandees have been moving in distraction [against them], though this is only the beginning of the contest.

And why should it not be so seeing that in your Majesty's reign the ministers have no power, the nobles enjoy no trust, the soldiers are wretchedly poor, the writers are without employment, the traders are without means, the peasantry are down-trodden? So, too, the kingdom of the Deccan,—which is a spacious country and a paradise on earth—has become desolate and ruined like a hill or desert; and the city of Burhanpur,—a mole of beauty on the cheek of the earth,—has become ruined and plundered; the city of Aurangabad, glorified by connection with your Majesty's name, is perturbed like quicksilver at the shock and injury received from the enemy's armies. On the Hindu tribes two calamities have descended, (first) the exaction of the *jaziya* in the towns and (second) the oppression of the enemy in the country. When such sufferings come down on the heads of the people from all sides, why should they not fail to pray for and thank their ruler? Men of high extraction and pure breed, belonging to ancient families, have disappeared and the offices and departments of your Majesty's government and the function of counselling on affairs of state, are in the hands of mechanics, low people and rascals,—like weavers, soap-vendors and tailors. These men, carrying the broad cloaks of fraud under their arms, and the snare of fraud and trickery, (to wit, the

rosary) in their hands, roll on their tongues certain traditions and religious maxims. Your Majesty trusts these confidants, counsellors and companions like Gabriel and Michal, and place yourself helplessly under their control. And these men, showing wheat [as samples] but selling barley,—by such pretexts make grass appear as a hill and a hill as grass [to you].

(Verses). In the reign of king Alamgir, the Holy Warrior,
 Soap-venders have become Sadar and Qazi !
 Weavers and *Jolahas* are boasting
 That at this banquet the king is their confi-
 dant !

Low people have gained so much power,
 That cultured persons have to seek shelter
 at *their* doors !

Such rank has been acquired by fools
 As even scholars can never attain to !
 God protect us from the calamitous age,
 In which the ass kicks at the Arab steed !
 The supreme magistrate is [vainly] treading
 on the wind,

While justice has become [as rare] as the
 phoenix itself !

The clerks and officers of State have taken to the practice of traders, and are buying posts with gold and selling them for shameful consideration. Every one who eats salt, destroys the saltcellar. The day seemed near when the palace of the State would be cracked.

When I beheld this to be the state of affairs [in the

realm] and saw no possibility of your Majesty's character being reformed, kingly spirit urged me to cleanse the realm of Hindustan of the brambles and weeds (viz. oppressors and lawless men), to promote men of learning and culture, and to destroy the foundations of tyranny and meanness,—so that mankind might, in easy circumstances and peaceful minds, engage in their respective professions, and good name,—which is synonymous with next life' and 'eternal existence,'—might remain [for me] on the pages of [the history of] the age. How happy would it be if Providence so befriends [your Majesty] that leaving this work in the hands of the humblest of your sons, your Majesty seeks the blessedness of going on a pilgrimage to the Holy Cities [Mecca and Medina], and thereby induces the whole world to utter praises and prayers for you!

Hitherto your Majesty has spent all your life in the quest of the things of this world—which are even more false than dreams, and even less constant than shadows. Now is the proper time for you to lay in provisions for the next life, in order to atone for your former deeds, done out of greed for this transitory world against your august father and noble brothers in the days of your youth.

(Verses). O! thou art past eighty years and art still asleep!

Thou wilt not get more than these few days. As for the lecture your Majesty has read to me in your

letter, I am ashamed of your presumption [in writing in that strain].

(Verses). What good did you do to your father,
That you expected all these [services] from
your son?

O thou that art teaching wisdom to mankind,
Administer to thy own self what thou art
preaching to others!

Thou art not curing thyself,

Then, for once, give up counselling others!

Concerning what your Majesty has written to me to go to your presence, although it is the highest blessing to enter your presence, yet by reason of my youth and my apprehension of your Majesty's vengeance—who behaved so notoriously towards your father and brothers,—my heart is naturally full of suspicion of such undeserved punishment. If, however, your Majesty goes to Ajmir with a small body of attendants, all these fears will be removed from my heart; it will gain confidence, and I shall secure the honour of waiting on you. Thereafter, with perfect composure of mind I shall carry out all your commands. To write more would be impolite.

[These two letters seem to be the work of some arch-plotter. One would think that the second letter—the reply—was conceived before the first was written. Then the letter to Akbar was drawn up, and couched in such terms as would elicit the bitter comments desired by the plotter, and which, if sent to Aurangzeb, would widen the breach between father and son and make reconciliation impossible. This is quite possible, for

(B)

Professor J. N. Sarkar seems to take great delight in bespattering Aurangzeb by charging him with every fault he has gleaned from any source whatsoever. In February, 1914, he contributed an article to the *Modern Review* in which he describes Aurangzeb's ruse of writing a false letter to his son, Akbar, to deceive the Rajputs.

As far as I have been able to sift the matter I find it a mere conjecture. There is no doubt that the Emperor's triumph over the Rajput confederacy was strange since all worldly means and circumstances seemed to have combined against him, and had apparently ensured his immediate downfall. Such extraordinary events generally give rise to conjectures and rumours, often unfounded. For this reason such a rumour got wind in those days. But Aurangzeb's life was full of extraordinary events.

His crossing the Chambal in spite of Dara's attempt to effectually bar his way; defeating Dara's overwhelming armies in a few hours' engagement; capturing Murad Bakhsh and putting that prince in prison

the Rajputs, at the time, bore no good-will towards the Mughal dynasty and towards Aurangzeb in particular; and whether Akbar wrote his reply under the influence of Durgadas or anybody else, or only set his signature to it, or whether it is altogether a forgery, the aim was the same—to weaken the Mughal power by causing dissension in the reigning family. That these letters are not forgeries, there is no certain proof. SADIQ ALI.]

when he was aspiring to crush him; baffling all Shah-jahan's measures to ensnare him; etc. etc. are all remarkable, and seem due rather to good luck on his part than to his strategy or skill.

Professor Sarkar informs us that he possesses three thousand letters of Aurangzeb's and he seems to have read many more in various libraries. But it is strange that he cannot produce the letter in question, which was certainly worth preserving, and which according to his belief fell into the hands of the Rajputs. Such a valuable letter they (the Rajputs) would have been sure to keep.

The Professor furnishes copies of many other letters, but the one which is essential for deciding the point at issue is not forthcoming. This fact alone is sufficient to throw a good deal of light on the nature of the charge. But I quote below a competent authority in confirmation of my opinion.

Khafi Khan is one of the best of Aurangzeb's historians, and quite impartial, and he has been admitted to be such by foreign historians also. His evidence can safely be considered conclusive. He says: "There was a rumour among the common people that the Emperor wrote a letter to Muhammad Akbar saying, 'Though you have perfectly followed my advice in gaining the Rajputs' confidence, watching their movements and bringing them together, I further wish you to put them all in the vanguard that they may become targets for arrows, both from the front

and the rear. This plan would prove highly advantageous to our cause.' It was sent in such a way as to fall into the hands of the Rajputs. On reading the contents the Rajputs dispersed:—But this statement I could not verify by any reliable evidence."

It should be borne in mind that Khafi Khan held high positions under Aurangzeb and later Mughals, and had personal knowledge of most of the events that he recorded, and the means of ascertaining the truth about them from many eye-witnesses. Therefore, when he could not find verification of this rumour it must remain nothing better than gossip, unless the original letter, in Aurangzeb's handwriting or under his sign-manual, be brought to light.

To illustrate further Professor Sarkar's attitude towards Aurangzeb, I refer my readers to his *History of Aurangzeb*, Vol. II, pages 235-6,

"He (Sulaiman Shukoh) then told the Emperor, with much self-possession, that if it were intended to give him *posta* to drink, he begged that he might be immediately put to death. Aurangzeb promised in a solemn manner, and in a loud voice, that this drink should most certainly not be administered, and that his mind might be perfectly easy."

"But the fate that Sulaiman Shukoh had dreaded more than death itself was meted out to him by Aurangzeb in violation of his solemn promise."

These slanderous statements of Bernier and Manucci, unsupported by any reliable evidence, are quoted by

Prof. Sarkar, who probably has at his disposal the best works on Aurangzeb's history. Some pages back, in the same book, he says in a footnote, (page 219).

"The popular story of the insult done to his (Dara's) severed head by Aurangzeb, rests solely on the doubtful authority of Bernier and Manucci."

If this and other facts resting on the sole authority of Bernier and Manucci are considered doubtful, why the other fact similarly resting on the sole authority of the admittedly doubtful or untrustworthy authors* should be taken for truth and inserted in the body of the work, as such, is very difficult to explain, unless the Profetsor's adverse mental attitude towards Aurangzeb add weight to the otherwise doubtful statement.

I take this opportunity of paying my last compliments to Signior Manucci and Monsieur Bernier.

According to their own statements both gentlemen reached the Mughal capital nearly at the same time. During the first eight or nine years both remained attached to the Mughal court, and being in such favourable situations were eye-witnesses of the chief occurrences of the Succession War, both were present at the Battle of Samugarh; both witnessed the events attending the capture of Murad Bakhsh, the execution of Dara, and the capture of Sulaiman Shukoh. Yet neither of them, in his detailed memoirs, makes any mention of being acquainted with or seeing the other, which fact is incom-

* See footnotes on pages 13, 57, 78, 158, 173 and 190 of Sarkar's "History of Aurangzeb."

prehensible considering that both were Europeans and contemporaries at Aurangzeb's Court for several years.

This fact throws a great deal of light on these two romancers with their myths. Bernier was for some time in India and in the Mughal capital and wrote his memoirs and letters. Manucci was also in India for many years. With the help of assistants (being himself nearly illiterate) he undertook to write his memoirs. He collected books on Indian subjects, among which *Bernier's Travels* was one * and seems to be his chief source of information. Common folklore was another source. Then by developing and embellishing the stories plagiarised from the books,—the reason why Manucci and Bernier so often agree,—and interlarding his narrative with much folklore according to his taste and inclinations, he produced a book which is presented to the world as containing his own knowledge and experience.

Professor Sarkar describes, on page 235 of his history the method of preparing *posta*, and the custom of giving it to the princes imprisoned in Gwalior fort, with the object of using it.

I have tried to verify this statement of administering *posta* to the imprisoned princes, but I can find no trustworthy evidence in any of the historians of the Indian Mughals.

I know something about the use and properties of *posta* or infusion of poppy capsules. It was and is

* That he possessed or perused this book we know from his reference to it.

still used in India, particularly in the Punjab, once, twice or more times daily, by many people, men and women, for the same purposes for which opium is habitually or occasionally used, but it is much weaker and milder in action, less harmful and much safer than opium. It is neither an active nor an accumulating poison, and is very uncertain in its narcotic properties. The senses and faculties of people addicted to *posta* are never seriously impaired, nor life shortened unless they indulge in its excessive use. Opium, *hashish* and *ganja* are much stronger and more poisonous drugs than *posta*.

The originators or inventors of the story about *posta* must have been ignorant of its properties. Bernier was a physician, but the opium-poppy not being indigenous to European countries the capsules were not used there, in Bernier's days, for making a soothing beverage as in India, so he was very likely not acquainted with the nature of *posta*.

In this case I do not understand why *posta* was preferred for the purpose when the result could have been attained more easily and speedily by the use of opium.

At the occurrence of such great events as a young prince's death in prison, it is not uncommon for the deceased's adherents and friends, and even indifferent people, to conjecture that death was caused by poison or other foul means; but such speculations and rumours, unless corroborated by some reliable evidence, ought not to be given in histories as facts.